



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JUNE 28, 2010

No. 98

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 28, 2010.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DONNA F. EDWARDS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair would now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:
Beneath Your creative hand, O Lord, every garden needs more attention.

Education and formation of character is never a finished product for Your people.

Constant care and oversight as well as discerning analysis and fresh energy are required daily for governance of a good society.

Therefore, Lord God, grant Your servants patience, perseverance, and determination to work hard to attain the goals Your Providence sets before us, today and every day as long as life shall last.

Reward the long labor of Senator ROBERT BYRD. Grant him eternal rest.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

HONORING STATE TROOPER WESLEY BROWN

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the memory of one of Maryland's finest, a member of our Maryland State Police, Maryland State Trooper Wesley Brown, who was shot to death without

warning while working on an off-duty security detail in the early morning of June 11. He was 24 years of age.

Though his life was cut far too short, Trooper Brown filled the years he was given with service to his community, mentoring young men, and love for his family.

It wasn't enough for Wesley to serve as a decorated State Trooper for more than 3 years. He also founded an organization called "Young Men Enlightening Younger Men," a group dedicated to teaching life and leadership skills to boys in Wesley's Seat Pleasant neighborhood, just a couple of miles from where I grew up in District Heights, Maryland.

Many of them came to regard Trooper Brown as a father figure. "I became a squared-away young man," said one of the pupils at his memorial service, "and I'll never forget that smile."

Wesley Brown's death was sudden and deeply unfair, but his community is better because he lived, and the seeds he sowed will outlive him. As the pastor said in Wesley's eulogy, "He showed us how to serve his brother man, and no one had to beg him to do it."

May all of those whom Trooper Brown left behind—his mother, Patricia Bell; his father, Sylvester Brown, Sr.; his fiancée, Ebony Norris; his seven brothers and sisters; and his grandmother, Rosella Bell—find comfort in the memory of his service and the greatness of his contribution to other young people.

We are protected every day by those who have the courage and commitment and love of country and neighbors to defend us here, our domestic defenders. Wesley Brown was one of those. God bless his soul.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H4879

CAROLINA DAY

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today all across South Carolina, residents are celebrating Carolina Day to commemorate the brave South Carolina patriots who defeated the British fleet on June 28, 1776, promoting American independence.

This victory saved Charleston from British occupation for another 4 years. It occurred at the first fort on Sullivan's Island, later named after its commander, Colonel William Moultrie. The battle at Fort Moultrie is known as the first decisive victory by American Revolutionaries.

This battle is just one example of the direct role South Carolina played in the Revolutionary War. Throughout the War for Independence, more than 200 battles and engagements took place in South Carolina, more than any other province.

One popular symbol of South Carolina's leadership in the Revolution is still seen today throughout the world: the yellow Gadsden Flag that reads, "Don't Tread on Me."

In 1775, Colonel Christopher Gadsden was representing South Carolina in the Continental Congress as five companies of Marines were about to join the Navy to intercept British ships. History has recorded that Colonel Gadsden presented his flag to the new commander-in-chief of the Navy, Commodore Esek Hopkins, before this critical mission.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Best wishes to the USC Gamecocks in the College World Series tonight at Omaha, Nebraska.

BRING OUR TROOPS HOME

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KUCINICH. In a little more than a year, the United States flew \$12 billion in cash to Iraq, much of it in hundred dollar bills, shrinkwrapped, loaded onto pallets. Vanity Fair reported in 2004 that at least \$9 billion of the cash had gone missing, unaccounted for. Nine billion.

Today, we learned that suitcases of \$3 billion in cash have openly moved through the Kabul airport. One U.S. official quoted by the Wall Street Journal said, "A lot of this looks like our tax dollars being stolen." Three billion dollars. Consider this step as the American people sweat out extension of unemployment benefits.

Last week, the BBC reported that the U.S. military has been giving tens of millions of dollars to Afghan security firms who are funneling the money to warlords. Add to that a corrupt Afghan government, underwritten by the lives of our troops. And now reports indicate

that Congress is preparing to attach \$10 billion in State education funding to a \$33 billion spending bill to keep the war going.

Back home millions of Americans are out of work, losing their homes, losing their savings, their pensions, their retirement security. We're losing our Nation to lies about the necessity of war.

Bring our troops home. End the war. Secure our economy.

NORTH KOREA

(Mr. DJOU asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DJOU. Mr. Speaker, I address the House this afternoon to remind our Nation of what has happened in the last 48 hours: The discussion of the Korean Peninsula has great impact and meaning upon our Nation as a whole.

I represent a congressional district that lies within the flight arc of North Korea's ballistic missiles. I am troubled by the report this morning in the Washington Post that the Korean Workers' Party in North Korea is trying to manage a dynastic transfer of its dictatorship from Kim Jong Il to his son, and I believe the United States must redouble its efforts to change this regime and establish a democratic and united Korea.

But I am also encouraged by the opportunity which has happened this past weekend and compliment President Obama for committing to a free trade agreement between the United States and South Korea.

Now is the time for us to further cement our bonds and our relationships between the United States and South Korea and make sure that we change the dictatorship in North Korea for the benefit of our Nation and the world as a whole.

CONGRATULATING STANLEY CUP CHAMPION CHICAGO BLACKHAWKS

(Mrs. BIGGERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the 2010 Stanley Cup Champions, the Chicago Blackhawks.

Founded in 1926, the Blackhawks are one of the National Hockey League's organizational six teams. The team has had a remarkable history, but this past season was very, very special.

On April 6, the Hawks won their 50th game of the season setting a new franchise record for wins in a season. During a game the very next night, they scored their 109th point of the season, setting yet another franchise record.

The Hawks made the playoffs for the second season in a row this year with a record of 52-22-8. They went on to defeat the Nashville Predators in the first round of the Stanley Cup, then the Vancouver Canucks, and the San Jose Sharks before facing the Philadel-

phia Flyers in the final round. In a tense game 6, the Hawks defeated the Flyers when Patrick Kane scored the game-winning Cup-clinching goal in sudden death overtime, marking the team's fourth Stanley Cup Championship—their first since 1961.

As the world saw during the Chicago parade in their honor, the city's sports fans moved past their long-time baseball rivalries and came together in support of the Blackhawks.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Blackhawks for their title and thank them on behalf of sports fans all over the metropolitan Chicago area for their contribution in making Chicago the dynamic sports city that it is.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6 p.m. today.

RECOGNIZING THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE CYBER DEFENSE COMPETITION

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1244) recognizing the National Collegiate Cyber Defense Competition for its now five-year effort to promote cyber security curriculum in institutions of higher learning, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1244

Whereas, on February 27, 2004, and February 28, 2004, a group of educators, students, and government and industry representatives gathered in San Antonio, Texas, to gauge the interest in and support for the establishment of regular cyber security exercises for postsecondary students;

Whereas stakeholders in the cyber security profession sought to create a cyber security exercise template for universities nationwide, and to encourage educational institutions to offer students practical experience in information assurance;

Whereas in an effort to develop a regular, national-level cyber security exercise, the Center for Infrastructure Assurance and Security at the University of Texas at San Antonio agreed to host the first Collegiate Cyber Defense Competition (CCDC) for the Southwestern region in April 2005;

Whereas the mission of the CCDC system is to provide institutions with an information assurance or computer security curriculum in a controlled, competitive environment to assess the student's depth of understanding and operational competency in managing the challenges inherent in protecting corporate network infrastructure and business information systems;

Whereas the CCDC has attracted participation from institutions of higher education from across the United States;

Whereas 2010 regional competition hosts include Southwest host Texas A&M University, North Central host Dakota State University, Northeast host University of Maine, Pacific Rim co-hosts University of Washington and Highline Community College, Midwest co-hosts Inver Hills Community College and Moraine Valley Community College, Mid-Atlantic host Community College of Baltimore County, Southeast host Kennesaw State University, and West Coast host California State Polytechnic University, Pomona;

Whereas 2010 regional competition winners include Towson University, DePaul University, Montana Tech of the University of Montana, Northeastern University, University of Washington, Texas A&M University, University of Louisville, and California State Polytechnic University, Pomona; and

Whereas the furtherance and development of cyber security academic programs in institutions of higher education will help meet the rapidly growing demand for cyber security specialists in the public and private sectors: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives recognizes the National Collegiate Cyber Defense Competition for its now five-year effort to promote cyber security curriculum in institutions of higher learning.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on House Resolution 1244 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of House Resolution 1244, which recognizes the National Collegiate Cyber Defense Competition for their 5-year effort to promote cyber security curriculum at institutions of higher education. Their dedication and commitment to cyber security instruction serves an important purpose as computer and Internet software continue their vital role in our digital world.

In February of 2004, a group of educators, students, and government and industry representatives in cyber defense gathered in San Antonio, Texas, to address the growing need for cyber security education for post-secondary students. These individuals understood the growing importance of, and the world's increasing reliance, on computer and Internet software, as well as the national security interest in protecting this vital infrastructure. From the gathering in San Antonio, the Collegiate Cyber Defense Competition was born.

The competition provides students the opportunity to improve their un-

derstanding and operational competency in protecting corporate network infrastructure and business information systems. For the past 5 years, the competition has offered computer security curriculum to students at institutions of higher education across the United States.

Many teams participated in this year's regional competition with winners including Towson University, DePaul University, Montana Tech, Northeastern University, University of Washington, Texas A&M University, University of Louisville, and California State Polytechnic University at Pomona. Students from these universities learned many skills and their education will help meet the rapidly growing demand for cyber security specialists in the public and private sectors.

□ 1415

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Representative RODRIGUEZ for introducing this resolution.

Once again, I express my support for House Resolution 1244, which recognizes the importance of the National Collegiate Cyber Defense Competition and its contribution to our Nation's cyber security curriculum.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1244, recognizing the National Collegiate Cyber Defense Competition for its 5-year effort to promote cyber security curriculum in institutions of higher education.

In April of 2005, the University of Texas at San Antonio held the first Collegiate Cyber Defense Competition, or CCDC, for the Southwestern region. The CCDC focuses on the operational aspects of managing and protecting an existing network's infrastructure. Teams acquire points based on their ability to deduct and respond to outside threats, to maintain availability of existing services such as mail servers and Web servers, to respond to business requests such as the addition or removal of additional services, and to balance security needs against business needs.

The mission of CCDC is to provide a controlled, competitive environment to assess a student's understanding and competency in managing the challenges inherent in protecting a corporate network or business information system. The competition is supported by members of the cyber security industry and by organizations that understand the importance of innovation in the field of cyber security.

The 2010 winner of the Collegiate Cyber Defense Competition was Northeastern University.

I urge my colleagues to join me in applauding this significant achievement, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may

consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ).

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Thank you for allowing me this opportunity to say a few words on cyber security in this particular exercise done by universities.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1244, recognizing the National Collegiate Cyber Defense Competition for its now 5-year effort to promote cyber security curriculum in institutions of higher education.

The Cyber Collegiate Defense Competition is a 3-day event and is the first competition of its kind that focuses on the operational aspect of managing and protecting an existing commercial network infrastructure. Students get a chance to test their knowledge in an operational environment and network within industry professionals who are always on the lookout for up-and-coming engineers.

On February 27 and 28 of 2004, a group of educators and students, government and industry representatives gathered in San Antonio, Texas, to discuss the feasibility and desirability of establishing such a program—this particular regular cyber security exercise with a uniformed structure for postsecondary-level students.

The Center for Infrastructure Assurance and Security at the University of Texas at San Antonio agreed to host the first Collegiate Cyber Defense Competition for the Southwestern region in April of 2005. The University of Texas at San Antonio is the National Center of Academic Excellence in Information Assurance Education by the National Security Agency and by the Department of Homeland Security.

The University of Texas at San Antonio is in my district, and I have been continually impressed with their pioneering approach to cyber security curricula. They have outstanding faculty and staff, all of whom recognize how critical information assurance is becoming in the 21st century.

This year's regional winners included Towson University, DePaul University, Montana Tech, Northeastern University, the University of Washington, Texas A&M University, the University of Louisville, and the California State Polytechnic University at Pomona.

I am also honored and privileged to have attended this year's competition and previous events and to have personally had the opportunity to congratulate the winners from Northeastern University, the champions of the national competition.

Let me just add that it is exciting to see these young people engage in this competition. We are hoping that, as we move forward, this will grow and allow other universities to participate and get engaged as these are the youngsters, in the words of some of them who describe themselves, who are the geek warriors who defend our infrastructure throughout our country and throughout the world. It was really exciting to see them not only in the competition but to see them participating. We have

these unique individuals who are extremely brilliant, who are out there doing a wonderful job, not only for the private sector but for the public sector.

In conclusion, I just want to believe that the National Collegiate Cyber Defense Competition is poised to expand and grow as cyber security becomes increasingly important for the public and the private sectors throughout the country and throughout the world. I hope this body will continue its strong work in supporting the cyber security profession while making sure we are providing the resources to train the next generation of cyber security professionals.

I want to take this opportunity to thank the chairwoman for allowing this particular legislation of recognition to come forward. Thank you very much.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I urge the support of this resolution.

I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. HIRONO. Once again, I would like to encourage all of my colleagues to support H. Res. 1244, the National Collegiate Cyber Defense Competition, and I congratulate all of the participants and the winners of this very important competition.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1244, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECOGNIZING SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 284) recognizing the work and importance of special education teachers, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 284

Whereas, in 1972, the United States Supreme Court ruled that children with disabilities have the same right to receive a quality education in the public schools as their non-disabled peers and, in 1975, the United States Congress passed Public Law 94-142 guaranteeing students with disabilities the right to a free appropriate public education;

Whereas, according to the Department of Education, approximately 6,600,000 children (roughly 13 percent of all school-aged children) receive special education services;

Whereas there are over 370,000 highly qualified special education teachers in the United States;

Whereas the work of special education teachers requires them to be able to interact and teach students with specific learning disabilities, hearing impairments, speech or language impairments, orthopedic impairments, visual impairments, autism, combined deafness and blindness, traumatic brain injury, and other health impairments;

Whereas special education teachers are dedicated, possess the ability to understand a diverse group of students' needs, and have the capacity to be innovative in their teaching methods for their unique group of students and understanding of the differences of the children in their care;

Whereas special education teachers must have the ability to interact and coordinate with a child's parents or legal guardians, social workers, school psychologists, occupational and physical therapists, and school administrators, as well as other educators to provide the best quality education for their students;

Whereas special education teachers help to develop an individualized education program for every special education student based on the student's needs and abilities; and

Whereas these unique individuals dedicate themselves so special education students are prepared for daily life after graduation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) recognizes the amount of work it requires to be a special education teacher; and
(2) commends special education teachers for their sacrifice and dedication while providing the quality life skills to individuals with special needs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on House Concurrent Resolution 284 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Ms. HIRONO. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 284, which recognizes the work and importance of special education teachers in our public education system. They serve a unique role in our country's schools, and their hard work equips students with disabilities with high-quality instruction and important life-long skills.

The historic ruling in *Mills v. Board of Education of the District of Columbia* ruled that all students with disabilities must be offered a public education regardless of the cost, and it was critical in setting the stage for our current special education system. Today, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act upholds this legacy by working to ensure the education of all students with disabilities. It is important for us

to continue working towards equal access to education for more than 6.6 million American students.

More than 370,000 dedicated, hard-working, and highly professional special education teachers currently serve our Nation's students. These teachers educate students with many different disabilities, helping those with learning disabilities, autism, combined deafness and blindness, traumatic brain injuries, hearing, visual, speech, language or orthopaedic impairments, and other types of health impairments. Through specific training and teaching practices, special educators can help these students learn regardless of their physical barriers.

Special educators have earned and rightfully deserve our recognition. They dedicate their time and professional careers to serving students who need specific and individual education plans not offered by a traditional education setting. Special education teachers also recognize that these students are no less deserving than any other students of a high-quality public education. For these reasons and many others, special education teachers are particularly special public servants.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Representative SESSIONS for introducing this resolution.

Once again, I express support for House Concurrent Resolution 284, which will recognize the immense contributions of America's special education teachers. So I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 284, recognizing the work and importance of special education teachers.

Special education teachers work with children and youth who are facing a variety of disabilities. Some special education teachers work with students with severe cognitive, emotional or physical disabilities, primarily teaching them life skills and basic literacy. Many special education teachers work with children with mild to moderate disabilities, using or modifying the general education curriculum to meet a child's individual needs and providing required remedial instruction.

These gifted educators work with students who are struggling with speech or language impairments, intellectual disabilities, autism, combined deafness and blindness, traumatic brain injury, and many other health impairments.

Special education teachers design and teach appropriate curricula, assign work geared toward each student's needs and abilities, and, of course, grade papers and homework assignments. They are involved in a student's behavioral, social and academic development, helping each student to develop emotionally and to interact effectively in social situations. Preparing special education students for

daily life after graduation is also an important aspect of the job.

Special education teachers help general educators adapt curriculum materials and teaching techniques to meet the needs of students with disabilities. They coordinate the work of teachers, teacher assistants and related personnel, such as therapists and social workers, to meet the individualized needs of the student within inclusive special education programs.

Whether teaching a class of special education students or working with individual students in a general classroom, special education teachers ensure that all students have access to a quality education. Today, we salute them for their commitment and dedication.

I support this resolution, and I ask my colleagues to do the same.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, in closing, among the cadre of our educators all across our country who deserve our thanks and recognition, our special education teachers occupy a particularly special place.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to discuss H. Con. Res. 284, legislation to recognize the work and importance of special education teachers in America.

In 1972, the United States Supreme Court ruled that children with disabilities have the right to the same quality public school education as their nondisabled peers. To fulfill this promise, in 1975 the United States Congress passed the Education of all Handicapped Children Act (EHA), which we now know as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act or IDEA, guaranteeing students with disabilities the right to a quality and appropriate public education.

It has been almost 40 years that children with special needs were granted the right and opportunity to obtain an education equal to every other child's in our country.

IDEA provides these individuals the opportunity to improve their quality of life through education while translating that to job skills in the real world.

Speaking as the parent of a child with special needs, I will always be grateful and indebted to the individuals we are honoring in today's resolution. They have dedicated their lives to improving the education of those students who begin with an intellectual or physical disadvantage than their peers.

According to the Department of Education approximately 6,600,000 children receive special education services; this is about 13 percent of our Pre-K, Elementary & Secondary student population in the United States combined.

In our school systems there are roughly 370,000 highly qualified special education teachers who wake up every day ready to educate children with special needs, while extending a hand to support the parents of these students during difficult times.

Distinct from the rest of their colleagues in the teaching profession, special education teachers work with students who have a range of disabilities that can consist of specific learn-

ing disabilities, physical impairments, speech or language impairments, autism, and other health and mental impairments.

While learning to engage and attend to every individual student's needs, special education teachers must also interact and coordinate with a child's parents or legal guardians, social workers, school psychologists, occupational and physical therapists, and school administrators, as well as other educators to provide the best quality education for their students.

In addition, these educators must produce innovative methods to maximize the learning capacity of each student, to make learning as easy as possible.

Recently I received a letter from a special education teacher in Texas,

Her name is Sunni McAsey and it reads

"I pick up my students from the bus stop 15 minutes before other teachers have students arrive in their classrooms. I am responsible for these students from the minute they arrive on campus until the minute they leave. Anything that happens with these kids is my sole responsibility. My students' abilities range from the intellectual capacity of a third grader to that of a 9 month old, all in one classroom, and each lesson that I create must be meaningful to every child in the room. My relationship with each child's parents is very close and I know more about each child than any teacher who teaches non-disabled students alone. I interact daily with parents who have accepted the cards dealt to them and are supportive of my work, but I have parents who are still grieving over their child's disability. My job includes so much more than most people are aware. I am a teacher, a nurse, a counselor, a parent, a disciplinarian, and everything else for these kids 8 hours a day. Why do I do it, you wonder? Because I truly love these kids. Even the slightest little gain is a big deal that we celebrate! Every gain is worth it in these kids' lives as well as their parents . . . Sincerely a teacher who wants to make a difference"

Mr. Speaker, teachers like Sunni McAsey deserve to be recognized for their hard work and dedication to educating our youth.

This resolution is the first of its kind in Congress to recognize the dedication and hard work that these educators put into their jobs, day in and day out.

My colleagues on both sides of the aisle recognize the importance of these teachers and their everyday work.

We are approaching almost 40 years in which children with special needs were given the right to obtain the same quality education as their non-disabled peers, and it's time we honored those providing that education.

I ask all of my colleagues to support this resolution that recognizes the work and importance of special education teachers in America.

Mr. HIRONO. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 284, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1430

MAJOR GENERAL DAVID F. WHERLEY, JR. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NATIONAL GUARD RETENTION AND COLLEGE ACCESS ACT

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3913) to direct the Mayor of the District of Columbia to establish a District of Columbia National Guard Educational Assistance Program to encourage the enlistment and retention of persons in the District of Columbia National Guard by providing financial assistance to enable members of the National Guard of the District of Columbia to attend undergraduate, vocational, or technical courses, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3913

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NATIONAL GUARD EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

The Act entitled "An Act to provide for the organization of the militia of the District of Columbia", approved March 1, 1889 (sec. 49—101 et seq., D.C. Official Code) is amended by adding at the end the following new title:

"TITLE II—EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

"SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE; FINDINGS.

"(a) SHORT TITLE.—This title may be cited as the 'Major General David F. Wherley, Jr. District of Columbia National Guard Retention and College Access Act'.

"(b) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

"(1) The District of Columbia National Guard is under the exclusive jurisdiction of the President of the United States as Commander-in-Chief and, unlike other National Guards, is permanently federalized.

"(2) The District of Columbia National Guard is unique and differs from the National Guards of the several States in that the District of Columbia National Guard is responsible, not only for residents of the District of Columbia, but also for a special and unique mission and obligation as a result of the extensive presence of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia.

"(3) Consequently, the President of the United States, rather than the chief executive of the District of Columbia, is in command of the District of Columbia National Guard, and only the President can call up the District of Columbia National Guard even for local emergencies.

"(4) The District of Columbia National Guard has been specifically trained to address the unique emergencies that may occur regarding the presence of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia.

"(5) The great majority of the members of the District of Columbia National Guard actually live in Maryland or Virginia, rather than in the District of Columbia.

“(6) The District of Columbia National Guard has been experiencing a disproportionate decline in force in comparison to the National Guards of Maryland and Virginia.

“(7) The States of Maryland and Virginia provide additional recruiting and retention incentives, such as educational benefits, in order to maintain their force, and their National Guards have drawn recruits from the District of Columbia at a rate that puts at risk the maintenance of the necessary force levels for the District of Columbia National Guard.

“(8) Funds for an educational benefit for members of the District of Columbia National Guard would provide an incentive to help reverse the loss of members to nearby National Guards and allow for maintenance and increase of necessary District of Columbia National Guard personnel.

“(9) The loss of members of the District of Columbia National Guard could adversely affect the readiness of the District of Columbia National Guard to respond in the event of a terrorist attack on the capital of the United States.

“SEC. 202. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NATIONAL GUARD EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

“(a) EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—The Mayor of the District of Columbia, in coordination with the commanding general of the District of Columbia National Guard, shall establish a program under which the Mayor may provide financial assistance to an eligible member of the District of Columbia National Guard to assist the member in covering expenses incurred by the member while enrolled in an approved institution of higher education to pursue the member's first undergraduate, masters, vocational, or technical degree or certification.

“(b) ELIGIBILITY.—

“(1) CRITERIA.—A member of the District of Columbia National Guard is eligible to receive assistance under the program established under this title if the commanding general of the District of Columbia National Guard certifies to the Mayor the following:

“(A) The member has satisfactorily completed required initial active duty service.

“(B) The member has executed a written agreement to serve in the District of Columbia National Guard for a period of not less than 6 years.

“(C) The member is not receiving a Reserve Officer Training Corps scholarship.

“(2) MAINTENANCE OF ELIGIBILITY.—To continue to be eligible for financial assistance under the program, a member of the District of Columbia National Guard must—

“(A) be satisfactorily performing duty in the District of Columbia National Guard in accordance with regulations of the National Guard (as certified to the Mayor by the commanding general of the District of Columbia National Guard);

“(B) be enrolled on a full-time or part-time basis in an approved institution of higher education; and

“(C) maintain satisfactory progress in the course of study the member is pursuing, determined in accordance with section 484(c) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1091(c)).

“SEC. 203. TREATMENT OF ASSISTANCE PROVIDED.

“(a) PERMITTED USE OF FUNDS.—Financial assistance received by a member of the District of Columbia National Guard under the program under this title may be used to cover—

“(1) tuition and fees charged by an approved institution of higher education involved;

“(2) the cost of books; and

“(3) laboratory expenses.

“(b) AMOUNT OF ASSISTANCE.—The amount of financial assistance provided to a member of the District of Columbia National Guard under the program may be up to \$400 per credit hour, but not to exceed \$6,000 per year. If the Mayor determines that the amount available to provide assistance under this title in any year will be insufficient, the Mayor may reduce the maximum amount of the assistance authorized, or set a limit on the number of participants, to ensure that amounts expended do not exceed available amounts.

“(c) RELATION TO OTHER ASSISTANCE.—Except as provided in section 202(b)(1)(C), a member of the District of Columbia National Guard may receive financial assistance under the program in addition to educational assistance provided under any other provision of law.

“(d) REPAYMENT.—A member of the District of Columbia National Guard who receives assistance under the program and who, voluntarily or because of misconduct, fails to serve for the period covered by the agreement required by section 202(b)(1) or fails to comply with the eligibility conditions specified in section 202(b)(2) shall be subject to the repayment provisions of section 373 of title 37, United States Code.

“SEC. 204. ADMINISTRATION AND FUNDING OF PROGRAM.

“(a) ADMINISTRATION.—The Mayor, in coordination with the commanding general of the District of Columbia National Guard and in consultation with approved institutions of higher education, shall develop policies and procedures for the administration of the program under this title. Nothing in this title shall be construed to require an institution of higher education to alter the institution's admissions policies or standards in any manner to enable a member of the District of Columbia National Guard to enroll in the institution.

“(b) FUNDING.—

“(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the District of Columbia such sums as may be necessary to enable the Mayor to provide financial assistance under the program. Funds appropriated pursuant to this authorization of appropriations shall remain available until expended.

“(2) TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—The Mayor may accept the transfer of funds from Federal agencies and use any funds so transferred for purposes of providing assistance under the program. There is authorized to be appropriated to the head of any executive branch agency such sums as may be necessary to permit the transfer of funds to the Mayor to provide financial assistance under this section.

“(3) LIMIT.—The aggregate amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraphs (1) and (2) for a fiscal year may not exceed—

“(A) for fiscal year 2011, \$370,000; and

“(B) for each succeeding fiscal year, the limit applicable under this paragraph for the previous fiscal year, adjusted by the tuition inflation index used for the year by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for education benefits under section 3015(h)(1) of title 38, United States Code.

“(c) ACCEPTANCE OF DONATIONS.—The Mayor may accept, use, and dispose of donations of services or property for purposes of providing assistance under the program.

“SEC. 205. DEFINITION.

“In this title, the term ‘approved institution of higher education’ means an institution of higher education (as defined in section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002)) that—

“(1) is eligible to participate in the student financial assistance programs under title IV

of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.); and

“(2) has entered into an agreement with the Mayor containing an assurance that funds made available under this title are used to supplement and not supplant other assistance that may be available for members of the District of Columbia National Guard.

“SEC. 206. EFFECTIVE DATE.

“Financial assistance may be provided under the program under this title to eligible members of the District of Columbia National Guard for periods of instruction that begin on or after January 1, 2010.”

SEC. 2. PAYGO COMPLIANCE.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia? There was no objection.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as amended, H.R. 3913 would require the Mayor of the District of Columbia to establish a program to provide financial assistance to members of the District of Columbia National Guard to assist in covering higher education expenses. The Mayor would establish this program in coordination with the commander of the District of Columbia National Guard. Assistance would be capped at \$6,000 per year per National Guard member.

H.R. 3913, as amended, authorizes appropriations to the District of Columbia for the assistance program. The bill would also authorize the transfer of funds from Federal agencies for providing assistance under the program. The initial authorization for the program is \$370,000 in FY 2011. The bill would permit annual adjustments in succeeding years based on the tuition inflation index used by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for educational benefits. As amended, H.R. 3913 complies with PAYGO requirements.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, the bill seeks to name the bill after former General David Wherley of the District of Columbia National Guard.

Mr. Speaker, I told the D.C. National Guard's 547th Transportation Company when they were deployed to Iraq about a year ago that I would introduce several D.C. National Guard bills concerning their service. Today, we consider the Major General David F.

Wherley, Jr. District of Columbia National Guard Retention and College Access Act to permanently authorize funding for a program to provide grants for secondary education tuition to the members of the D.C. National Guard.

The bill authorizes an education incentive program recommended by former Major General David Wherley and his successor, Major General Errol Schwartz, who suggested that education grants would be useful in stemming the troublesome loss of members of the D.C. Guard to units, in part, because surrounding States offer just such educational benefits.

I am grateful that the Appropriations Committee has allotted funds in some years, with smaller contributions from the District, in the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations bill. A permanent authorization is necessary, however, to ensure that D.C. National Guard members receive equal treatment and benefits with other National Guard members on a regular basis, especially with surrounding States that do, in fact, have the higher education benefits we seek for the D.C. National Guard. The Guard for the Nation's Capital is competing for members from the pool of regional residents who find membership in Maryland and Virginia Guards more financially beneficial.

Mr. Speaker, last week, on June 22, we marked the 1-year anniversary of the commemoration of the Metro collision here involving two Red Line trains that took the lives of nine area residents, seven from the District of Columbia, including a local hero, Major General David F. Wherley, Jr., and his wife Ann. This bill is named in honor of General Wherley, who not only served his country all his adult life and never forgot the men and women who served under him at home or at war, but also was particularly attentive to the residents of the District of Columbia, especially the city's most troubled youth. Thereafter, Congressman JOSÉ SERRANO, chair of the Committee on Appropriations Financial Services Subcommittee, was good enough to offer this renaming in his appropriations bill last year and to appropriate the funds without authorization this year or in prior years.

Under General Wherley's command, the D.C. National Guard deployed several of its units to the global war on terrorism. General Wherley himself served courageously in both Iraq and Afghanistan, but at home he spent hours with me figuring out ways to get funds for programs for the District's children. We were successful, because he would show up, not only in my office, but wherever he was needed to get the funds to do the service for his men and for the children of this city.

General Wherley was a full-service leader. He not only commanded the D.C. National Guard; he worked closely with me and with city officials on programs for our city and its disadvan-

tagged youth and for keeping our Guard competitive as a premier force at home as well as abroad.

The education incentives in this bill serve not only to encourage high-quality recruits, but, when appropriated, have had the important benefit of helping the D.C. National Guard to maintain the force necessary to protect the Federal presence, because this funding helps equalize an important benefit compared with what is offered by Guard units in surrounding jurisdictions which also are open to D.C. National Guard members.

While the appropriators have been good enough to provide funding for the D.C. National Guard by considering it a programmatic request, it is imperative that this important educational initiative be authorized appropriately to ensure its permanent sustainability.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join with my colleague, the Delegate from Washington, D.C. This bill quite appropriately is named in honor of an individual within the Federal District who served the community well and, more importantly, the context and the substance of this bill gives equity to those men and women who serve in the National Guard for the Federal District of Columbia and gives them equity with those States that surround the Federal District.

I think many times Congress is asked to give special attention to our residents in the Federal District, and I think this is one of fairness, equity, one that I think is well within our constitutional, not only our rights, but our responsibilities to represent not just those in our own districts, but to recognize that the Federal District is a district for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3913, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRATULATING THE CHICAGO BLACKHAWKS

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1439) congratulating the Chicago Blackhawks on winning the 2010 Stanley Cup Championship.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1439

Whereas the historic Chicago Blackhawks, as one of the "Original Six", have made countless contributions to sports;

Whereas the Blackhawks and the National Hockey League have demonstrated a commitment to promoting fitness and leadership skills for youth through support for youth hockey programs and community skating facilities;

Whereas with 101 straight home game sellouts, and an NHL leading regular-season average attendance of 21,356, the Blackhawks are the pride of their hometown, Chicago, Illinois;

Whereas in just 3 years, the Blackhawks organization of Rocky Wirtz, Joel Quenneville, John McDonough, Stan Bowman, Scotty Bowman, Jay Blunk, and Dale Tallon have revitalized a franchise and reminded Chicago that it has always been a hockey town;

Whereas the Chicago Blackhawks, through amazing offense, superb defense, and unmatched depth, dominated the regular season and won 52 games;

Whereas the Blackhawks defeated the Nashville Predators in 6 games, the Vancouver Canucks in 6 games, and swept the number 1 seeded San Jose Sharks to become the Western Conference Champions and advance to the Stanley Cup Final;

Whereas in the Stanley Cup Final series, the Blackhawks held off the aggressive play and talent of the Eastern Conference Champion Philadelphia Flyers, who deserve great credit, to win in overtime, and provide one of the most exciting final series in recent history; and

Whereas the innumerable contributions from every player, coach, and the entire Blackhawks family have ended the 49-year-long championship drought and brought the roar back to Madison Street and Lord Stanley's Cup to where it belongs, sweet home Chicago: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the Chicago Blackhawks for their long distinguished history, countless contributions to sports, and their many successes as a franchise;

(2) congratulates the Blackhawks on an amazing season and for winning the 2010 Stanley Cup Championship;

(3) recognizes the players, coaches, and leadership of the Blackhawks organization; and

(4) joins with all people in the United States and hockey fans all over the world in celebrating the return of the Stanley Cup to Chicago, Illinois.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members shall have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia? There was no objection.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Oversight and Government

Reform, I am pleased to present H. Res. 1439 for consideration. The bill congratulates the Chicago Blackhawks for their victory over the Philadelphia Flyers in the National Hockey League Stanley Cup Finals.

H. Res. 1439 was introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, Representative MIKE QUIGLEY, on May 25, 2010. It was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, which ordered it to be reported by unanimous consent on June 14, 2010. The measure has the support of over 50 Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, on June 9, 2010, the Chicago Blackhawks defeated the Philadelphia Flyers in Philadelphia to win the NHL's Stanley Cup Final hockey series. With that win, the Chicago Blackhawks ended 49 years of Stanley Cup frustration with a 4-3 overtime victory over the Philadelphia Flyers in a game that was numbered game six and clinched the National Hockey League's best-of-seven championship series. The Philadelphia Flyers were worthy opponents and should be congratulated for a hard-fought Stanley Cup series.

Blackhawks captain Jonathan Toews, who scored seven goals in the playoffs and had 22 assists, including one on Chicago's first goal, was awarded the Conn Smythe Trophy for most valuable player for his team in the NHL playoffs.

The Philadelphia Flyers fought hard, but they were no match for the hard-hitting, exciting brand of hockey of Blackhawks general manager Stan Bowman and head coach Joel Quenneville.

Not since the days of Hall of Famers Bobby Hull, Stan Mikita and goalie Glenn Hall had the Blackhawks hoisted the cup, and Chicago unleashed nearly 50 years of frustration with a euphoric celebration on Philadelphia's home ice.

I join my colleagues in congratulating the National Hockey League champions, the Chicago Blackhawks, on their victory in the 2010 Stanley Cup Finals.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1445

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as somebody that resides in north San Diego County, I spend a lot of time in the water at the Pacific Ocean, but I have never spent very much time on the ice. As a San Diegan, I find it very interesting the entire concept of somebody playing a game on the ice. But I join today in supporting this resolution and congratulating the Blackhawks in their victory.

I still would love to learn more about the game, but I'd like to do it from afar, as long as I can stay warm.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illi-

nois, the sponsor of the bill (Mr. QUIGLEY).

Mr. QUIGLEY. To my colleagues, I appreciate their ability to pronounce names they're not necessarily so familiar with so well, and I appreciate those who cosponsored this legislation.

About 3 weeks ago, several hundred brave Chicago Blackhawk hockey fans sat in Philadelphia and wondered why Patrick Kane was flying across the ice in celebration. He scored the goal that no one saw—the goal that has brought an end to 49 years of frustration for Blackhawk fans and exorcised the ghost of the demons of Jacques Lemaire in 1971. He helped make the Chicago Blackhawks the Stanley Cup Champions.

It was a long, extraordinarily tough road for these players. Many of these players competed in over 120 games, when you count the Olympics—an extraordinarily grueling task for them to accomplish this. But that goal set off a celebration that ended with 2 million people in downtown Chicago in a parade. It set off a celebration in Philadelphia among a few fans that were there from Chicago, and among the alumni of Blackhawks, including Bobby Hull, Stan Mikita, Tony Esposito, Denis Savard, and many others. Unfortunately, many alumni are no longer with us—Hawk legends who are forever in our hearts, such as Keith Magnuson and Pit Martin. But it also set off an extraordinary celebration in Chicago, which, for many of us, is still going on.

There are many people to thank, the first of which, as far as I understand, is the only truly popular owner I know in professional sports, Rocky Wirtz, who combined his full efforts with dedication to bring a championship to Chicago; John McDonough, the president of the team; Jay Blunk, Stan Bowman, and Scotty Bowman, who were extraordinary in putting this team together and advising it; along with Dale Tallon, who's no longer with the team but to whom we owe a great deal of gratitude; defenseman Duncan Keith, the James Norris Memorial Trophy winner this year; Captain Jonathan Toews, who won the Conn Smythe Trophy; and a team of all-stars, including Brian Campbell. We had several Olympians who also competed. We have players who won the Stanley Cup and the Gold Medal in 1 year, which doesn't happen all the time.

But my main message today is to all those long-suffering, dedicated Blackhawk fans who have enjoyed this victory ever since; the fans who understood what it was like to cheer for Pierre Pilote and Denis Savard and Tony Esposito in all the years in which we didn't quite make the playoffs, but they loved the "madhouse on Madison" as much as I did and look forward to many more years of excitement from this team that Mr. Wirtz has brought us. It was a wonderful night, and we appreciate your cosponsorships.

Ms. NORTON. I just want to congratulate my colleague Mr. QUIGLEY,

and I understand why he and Chicago are ecstatic. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman again, and Chicago, which has had a pretty good run the last couple of years. Seeing that I know how committed the hockey fans are, I will join with my colleagues in urging the Members to support the passage of H.R. 1439.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1439.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE UNIFORMED DIVISION MOD- ERNIZATION ACT OF 2010

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1510) to transfer statutory entitlements to pay and hours of work authorized by the District of Columbia Code for current members of the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division from the District of Columbia Code to the United States Code, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the amendments is as follows:

Amendments:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "United States Secret Service Uniformed Division Modernization Act of 2010".

TITLE I—PERSONNEL RULES FOR UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE UNIFORMED DIVISION

SEC. 101. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this title is to transfer statutory entitlements to pay and hours of work authorized by laws codified in the District of Columbia Official Code for current members of the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division from such laws to the United States Code.

SEC. 102. HUMAN RESOURCES FOR UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE UNIFORMED DIVISION.

(a) PAY FOR MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE UNIFORMED DIVISION.—Subpart I of part III of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"CHAPTER 102—UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE UNIFORMED DIVISION PERSONNEL

"Sec.

“10201. Definitions.
 “10202. Authorities.
 “10203. Basic pay.
 “10204. Rate of pay for original appointments.
 “10205. Service step adjustments.
 “10206. Technician positions.
 “10207. Promotions.
 “10208. Demotions.
 “10209. Clothing allowances.
 “10210. Reporting requirement.

“§ 10201. Definitions

“In this chapter—
 “(1) the term ‘member’ means an employee of the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division having the authorities described under section 3056A(b) of title 18;
 “(2) the term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security; and

“(3) the term ‘United States Secret Service Uniformed Division’ has the meaning given that term under section 3056A of title 18.

“§ 10202. Authorities

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to—

“(1) fix and adjust rates of basic pay for members of the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division, subject to the requirements of this chapter;

“(2) determine what constitutes an acceptable level of competence for the purposes of section 10205;

“(3) establish and determine the positions at the Officer and Sergeant ranks to be included as technician positions; and

“(4) determine the rate of basic pay of a member who is changed or demoted to a lower rank, in accordance with section 10208.

“(b) DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY.—The Secretary is authorized to delegate to the designated agent or agents of the Secretary, any power or function vested in the Secretary under in this chapter.

“(c) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary may prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to administer this chapter.

“§ 10203. Basic pay

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The annual rates of basic pay of members of the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division shall be fixed in accordance with the following schedule of rates, except that the payable annual rate of basic pay for positions at the Lieutenant, Captain, and Inspector ranks is limited to 95 percent of the rate of pay for level V of the Executive Schedule under subchapter II of chapter 53.

“Rank	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Step 6	Step 7	Step 8	Step 9	Step 10	Step 11	Step 12	Step 13
Officer	\$44,000	\$46,640	\$49,280	\$51,920	\$54,560	\$57,200	\$59,840	\$62,480	\$65,120	\$67,760	\$70,400	\$73,040	\$75,680
Sergeant				59,708	62,744	65,780	68,816	71,852	74,888	77,924	80,960	83,996	87,032
Lieutenant					69,018	72,358	75,698	79,038	82,378	85,718	89,058	92,398	95,738
Captain						79,594	83,268	86,942	90,616	94,290	97,964	101,638	105,312
Inspector							91,533	95,758	99,983	104,208	108,433	112,658	116,883
Deputy Chief	The rate of basic pay for Deputy Chief positions will be equal to 95 percent of the rate of pay for level V of the Executive Schedule.												
Assistant Chief	The rate of basic pay the Assistant Chief position will be equal to 95 percent of the rate of pay for level V of the Executive Schedule.												
Chief	The rate of basic pay the Chief position will be equal to the rate of pay for level V of the Executive Schedule.												

“(b) SCHEDULE ADJUSTMENT.—

“(1)(A) Effective at the beginning of the first pay period commencing on or after the first day of the month in which an adjustment in the rates of basic pay under the General Schedule takes effect under section 5303 or other authority, the schedule of annual rates of basic pay of members (except the Deputy Chiefs, Assistant Chief and Chief) shall be adjusted by the Secretary by a percentage amount corresponding to the percentage adjustment made in the rates of pay under the General Schedule.

“(B) The Secretary may establish a methodology of schedule adjustment that—

“(i) results in uniform fixed-dollar step increments within any given rank; and

“(ii) preserves the established percentage differences among rates of different ranks at the same step position.

“(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the payable annual rate of basic pay for positions at the Lieutenant, Captain, and Inspector ranks after adjustment under paragraph (1) may not exceed 95 percent of the rate of pay for level V of the Executive Schedule under subchapter II of chapter 53.

“(3) Locality-based comparability payments authorized under section 5304 shall be applicable to the basic pay for all ranks under this section, except locality-based comparability payments may not be paid at a rate which, when added to the rate of basic pay otherwise payable to the member, would cause the total to exceed the rate of basic pay payable for level IV of the Executive Schedule.

“§ 10204. Rate of pay for original appointments

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), all original appointments shall be made at the minimum rate of basic pay for the Officer rank set forth in the schedule in section 10203.

“(b) EXCEPTION FOR SUPERIOR QUALIFICATIONS OR SPECIAL NEED.—The Director of the United States Secret Service or the designee of the Director may appoint an individual at a rate above the minimum rate of basic pay for the Officer rank based on the individual's superior qualifications or a special need of the Government for the individual's services.

“§ 10205. Service step adjustments

“(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘calendar week of active service’ includes all periods of leave with pay or other paid time off, and periods of non-pay status which do not cumulatively equal one 40-hour workweek.

“(b) ADJUSTMENTS.—Each member whose current performance is at an acceptable level of competence shall have a service step adjustment as follows:

“(1) Each member in service step 1, 2, or 3 shall be advanced successively to the next higher service step at the beginning of the first pay period immediately following the completion of 52 calendar weeks of active service in the member's service step.

“(2) Each member in service step 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, or 11 shall be advanced successively to the next higher service step at the beginning of the first pay period immediately following the completion of 104 calendar weeks of active service in the member's service step.

“(3) Each member in service step 12 shall be advanced successively to the next higher service step at the beginning of the first pay period immediately following the completion of 156 calendar weeks of active service in the member's service step.

“§ 10206. Technician positions

“(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Each member whose position is determined under section 10202(a)(3) to be included as a technician position shall, on or after such date, receive, in addition to the member's scheduled rate of basic pay, an amount equal to 6 percent of the sum of such member's rate of basic pay and the applicable locality-based comparability payment.

“(2) A member described in this subsection shall receive the additional compensation authorized by this subsection until such time as the member's position is determined under section 10202(a)(3) not to be a technician position, or until the member no longer occupies such position, whichever occurs first.

“(3) The additional compensation authorized by this subsection shall be paid to a member in the same manner and at the same time as the member's basic pay is paid.

“(b) EXCEPTIONS.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the additional compensation authorized by subsection (a)(1) shall be considered as basic pay for all purposes, including section 8401(4).

“(2) The additional compensation authorized by subsection (a)(1) shall not be considered as basic pay for the purposes of—

“(A) section 5304; or

“(B) section 7511(a)(4).

“(3) The loss of the additional compensation authorized by subsection (a)(1) shall not constitute an adverse action for the purposes of section 7512.

“§ 10207. Promotions

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Each member who is promoted to a higher rank shall receive basic pay at the same step at which such member was being compensated prior to the date of the promotion.

“(b) CREDIT FOR SERVICE.—For the purposes of a service step adjustment under section 10205, periods of service at the lower rank shall be credited in the same manner as if it was service at the rank to which the employee is promoted.

“§ 10208. Demotions

“When a member is changed or demoted from any rank to a lower rank, the Secretary may fix the member's rate of basic pay at the rate of pay for any step in the lower rank which does not exceed the lowest step in the lower rank for which the rate of basic pay is equal to or greater than the member's existing rate of basic pay.

“§ 10209. Clothing allowances

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the benefits provided under section 5901, the Director of the United States Secret Service or the designee of the Director is authorized to provide a clothing allowance to a member assigned to perform duties in normal business or work attire purchased at the discretion of the employee. Such clothing allowance shall not be treated as part of the member's basic pay for any purpose (including retirement purposes) and shall not be used for the purpose of computing the member's overtime pay, pay during leave or other paid time off, lump-sum payments under section 5551 or section 5552, workers' compensation, or any

other benefit. Such allowance for any member may be discontinued at any time upon written notification by the Director of the United States Secret Service or the designee of the Director.

“(b) MAXIMUM AMOUNT AUTHORIZED.—A clothing allowance authorized under this section shall not exceed \$500 per annum.

“§ 10210. Reporting requirement

“Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this chapter, the Secretary shall prepare and transmit to Congress a report on the operation of this chapter. The report shall include—

“(1) an assessment of the effectiveness of this chapter with respect to efforts of the Secretary to recruit and retain well-qualified personnel; and

“(2) recommendations for any legislation or administrative action which the Secretary considers appropriate.”.

(b) ANNUAL LEAVE LIMITATION FOR MEMBERS IN THE DEPUTY CHIEF, ASSISTANT CHIEF, AND CHIEF RANKS.—Section 6304(f)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (F), by striking “or” after the semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (G), by striking the period and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(H) a position in the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division at the rank of Deputy Chief, Assistant Chief, or Chief.”.

(c) SICK LEAVE FOR WORK-RELATED INJURIES AND ILLNESSES.—Section 6324 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “Executive Protective Service force” and inserting “United States Secret Service Uniformed Division”;;

(2) in subsection (b)(3), by striking “the Treasury for the Executive Protective Service force” and inserting “Homeland Security for the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) This section shall not apply to members of the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division who are covered under chapter 84 for the purpose of retirement benefits.”.

SEC. 103. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.

(a) CONVERSION TO NEW SALARY SCHEDULE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) RATES OF PAY FIXED.—Effective the first day of the first pay period which begins after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall fix the rates of basic pay for members of the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division, as defined under section 10201 of title 5, United States Code, (as added by section 102(a)) in accordance with the provisions of this subsection.

(B) RATE BASED ON CREDITABLE SERVICE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Each member shall be placed in and receive basic pay at the corresponding scheduled rate under chapter 102 of title 5, United States Code, as added by section 102(a) (after any adjustment under paragraph (3) of this subsection) in accordance with the member's total years of creditable service, as provided in the table in this clause. If the scheduled rate of basic pay for the step to which the member would be assigned in accordance with this paragraph is lower than the member's rate of basic pay immediately before the date of enactment of this paragraph, the member shall be placed in and receive basic pay at the next higher service step, subject to the provisions of clause (iv). If the member's rate of pay exceeds the highest step of the rank, the rate of basic pay shall be determined in accordance with clause (iv).

Full Years of Creditable Service	Step Assigned Upon Conversion
0	1
1	2
2	3
3	4
5	5
7	6
9	7
11	8
13	9
15	10
17	11
19	12
22	13

(ii) CREDITABLE SERVICE.—For the purposes of this subsection, a member's creditable service is any police service in pay status with the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division, the United States Park Police, or the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police Department.

(iii) STEP 13 CONVERSION MAXIMUM RATE.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—A member who, at the time of conversion, is in step 13 of any rank below Deputy Chief, is entitled to that rate of basic pay which is the greater of—

(aa) the rate of pay for step 13 under the new salary schedule; or

(bb) the rate of pay for step 14 under the pay schedule in effect immediately before conversion.

(II) STEP 14 RATE.—Clause (iv) shall apply to a member whose pay is set in accordance with subclause (I)(bb).

(iv) ADJUSTMENT BASED ON FORMER RATE OF PAY.—

(I) DEFINITION.—In this clause, the term “former rate of basic pay” means the rate of basic pay last received by a member before the conversion.

(II) IN GENERAL.—If, as a result of conversion to the new salary schedule, the member's former rate of basic pay is greater than the maximum rate of basic pay payable for the rank of the member's position immediately after the conversion, the member is entitled to basic pay at a rate equal to the member's former rate of basic pay, and increased at the time of any increase in the maximum rate of basic pay payable for the rank of the member's position by 50 percent of the dollar amount of each such increase.

(III) PROMOTIONS.—For the purpose of applying section 10207 of title 5, United States Code, relating to promotions, (as added by section 102(a)) an employee receiving a rate above the maximum rate as provided under this clause shall be deemed to be at step 13.

(2) CREDIT FOR SERVICE.—Each member whose position is converted to the salary schedule under chapter 102 of title 5, United States Code, (as added by section 102(a)) in accordance with this subsection shall be granted credit for purposes of such member's first service step adjustment made after conversion to the salary schedule under that chapter for all satisfactory service performed by the member since the member's last increase in basic pay before the adjustment under this section.

(3) ADJUSTMENTS DURING TRANSITION.—The schedule of rates of basic pay shall be in-

creased by the percentage of any annual adjustment applicable to the General Schedule authorized under section 5303 of title 5, United States Code, or any other authority, which takes effect during the period beginning on January 1, 2010, through the last day of the last pay period preceding the first pay period which begins after the date of the enactment of this Act. The Secretary of Homeland Security may establish a methodology of schedule adjustment that results in uniform fixed-dollar step increments within any given rank and preserves the established percentage differences among rates of different ranks at the same step position.

(b) IMPACT ON BENEFITS UNDER THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE AND FIREFIGHTERS' RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM.—

(1) SALARY INCREASES FOR PURPOSES OF CERTAIN PENSIONS AND ALLOWANCES.—The conversion of positions and members of the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division to appropriate ranks in the salary schedule set forth in this title and the amendments made by this title, and the initial adjustments of rates of basic pay of those positions and individuals in accordance with this title and the amendments made by this title, shall be treated as an increase of 2.50 percent in the salary of current members for purposes of section 3 of the Act entitled “An Act to provide increased pensions for widows and children of deceased members of the Police Department and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia”, approved August 4, 1949 (sec. 5-744, D.C. Official Code) and section 301 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953 (sec. 5-745, D.C. Official Code).

(2) TREATMENT OF RETIREMENT BENEFITS AND PENSIONS OF CURRENT AND FORMER MEMBERS.—Except as otherwise provided in this title, nothing in this title shall affect retirement benefits and pensions of current members and former members who have retired under the District of Columbia Police and Firefighters' Retirement and Disability System.

SEC. 104. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—To the extent that any provision of any law codified in the District of Columbia Official Code that authorizes an entitlement to pay or hours of work for current members of the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division is not expressly revoked by this title, such provision shall not apply to such members after the effective date of this Act.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO LAWS CODIFIED IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA OFFICIAL CODE.—The following laws codified in the District of Columbia Official Code are amended as follows:

(1) The Act entitled “An Act to provide for granting to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and the White House and United States Park Police forces additional compensation for working on holidays”, approved October 24, 1951, is amended—

(A) in the second sentence of section 1 (sec. 5—521.01, D.C. Official Code), by striking “the Fire Department of the District of Columbia,” and all that follows through “and the United States Park Police Force” and inserting “the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and the United States Park Police Force”;

(B) in section 2 (sec. 5—521.02, D.C. Official Code), by striking “and with respect” and all that follows through “United States Park Police force” and inserting “and with respect to officers and members of the United States Park Police force”; and

(C) in section 3 (sec. 5—521.03, D.C. Official Code), by striking “shall be applicable” and all that follows and inserting the following: “shall be applicable to the United States Park Police force under regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior.”

(2) The District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 is amended as follows:

(A) In section 202 (sec. 5—542.02, D.C. Official Code), by striking “United States Secret Service Uniformed Division.”

(B) In section 301(b) (sec. 5—543.01(b), D.C. Official Code), by striking “the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division.”

(C) In section 302 (sec. 5—543.02, D.C. Official Code)—

(i) in subsection (a), by striking “the Secretary of Treasury, in the case of the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division.”;

(ii) in subsection (b), by striking “the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division or”;

(iii) in subsection (e), by striking “the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division or”.

(D) In section 303(a)(5) (sec. 5—543.03(a)(5), D.C. Official Code), by striking “the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division and”.

(E) In section 304(d)(1) (sec. 5—543.04(d)(1)), by striking “the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division or”.

(F) In section 305 (sec. 5—543.05, D.C. Official Code)—

(i) by striking “the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division.”;

(ii) by striking “or the Secretary of the Treasury.”

(G) In section 501 (sec. 5—545.01, D.C. Official Code)—

(i) in subsection (a), by striking “and the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division”;

(ii) in subsection (c)(1)—

(I) by striking “the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division and”, and

(II) in the schedule set forth in such subsection, by striking “United States Secret Service Uniformed Division”;

(iii) in subsection (c)(2), by striking “the annual rates of basic compensation” and all that follows through “the Secretary of the Treasury, and”;

(iv) in subsection (c)(5), by striking “officers and members of the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division or”;

(v) in subsection (c)(6)(A), by striking “the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division or”;

(vi) in subsection (c)(7)(A), by striking “the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division or”.

(H) In section 506 (sec. 5—545.06, D.C. Official Code), by striking “, the Secretary of the Treasury.”

(3) Section 118 of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 1998, is amended by striking subsection (b) (sec. 5—561.01, D.C. Official Code).

(4) Section 905(a)(1) of the Law Enforcement Pay Equity Act of 2000 (Public Law 106—554; sec. 5—561.02(a)(1), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking “the Secretary of Treasury” and all that follows through “United States Secret Service Uniformed Division, and”.

(5) Subsection (k)(2)(B) of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act (sec. 5—716(b)(2), D.C. Official Code) is amended by inserting “, or, for a member who was an officer or member of the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division, or the United States Secret Service Division, 40 percent of the corresponding salary for step 5 of the Officer rank in section 10203 of title 5, United States Code” after “member's death”.

(6) Section 1 of the Act entitled “An Act to provide a 5-day week for officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, and the White House Police force, and for other purposes”, approved August 15, 1950 (sec. 5—1304, D.C. Official Code), is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1)—

(i) by inserting “and” before “the Secretary of the Interior”; and

(ii) by striking “, and the Secretary of the Treasury in the case of the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division”;

(B) in subsection (a)(9)—

(i) by inserting “or” before “the United States Park Police force”; and

(ii) by striking “or the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division”;

(C) in subsection (b)—

(i) by inserting “or” before “the Secretary of the Interior”; and

(ii) by striking “or the Secretary of the Treasury.”;

(D) in subsection (h)(3)(A), by striking “of the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division or”;

(E) in subsection (h)(3)(B), by striking “of the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division or”.

(7) Section 117(a) of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act Amendments of 1972 (sec. 5—1305, D.C. Official Code) is amended—

(A) by striking “the Fire Department of the District of Columbia,” and all that follows through “or the United States Park Police force” and inserting “the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, or the United States Park Police force”; and

(B) by striking “, the Secretary of the Treasury.”

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO THE UNITED STATES CODE.—Title 5 of the United States Code is amended—

(1) in section 5102(c)(5), by striking “the Executive Protective Service” and inserting “the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division”;

(2) in section 5541(2)(iv)(II), by striking “a member of the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division.”;

(3) in the table of chapters for subpart I of part III by adding at the end the following:

“102. United States Secret Service Uniformed Division Personnel 10201”.

SEC. 105. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This title and the amendments made by this title shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE II—FEDERAL REAL PROPERTY DISPOSAL ENHANCEMENT

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Federal Real Property Disposal Enhancement Act of 2010”.

SEC. 202. DUTIES OF THE GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION AND EXECUTIVE AGENCIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 524 of title 40, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 524. Duties of the General Services Administration and executive agencies

“(a) DUTIES OF THE GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION.—

“(1) GUIDANCE.—The Administrator shall issue guidance for the development and implementation of agency real property plans. Such guidance shall include recommendations on—

“(A) how to identify excess properties;

“(B) how to evaluate the costs and benefits involved with disposing of real property;

“(C) how to prioritize disposal decisions based on agency missions and anticipated future need for holdings; and

“(D) how best to dispose of those properties identified as excess to the needs of the agency.

“(2) ANNUAL REPORT.—(A) The Administrator shall submit an annual report, for each of the first 5 years after 2010, to the congressional committees listed in subparagraph (C) based on data submitted from all executive agencies, detailing executive agency efforts to reduce their real property assets and the additional information described in subparagraph (B).

“(B) The report shall contain the following information for the year covered by the report:

“(i) The aggregated estimated market value and number of real property assets under the custody and control of all executive agencies, set forth government-wide and by agency, and for each at the constructed asset level and at the facility/installation level.

“(ii) The aggregated estimated market value and number of surplus real property assets under the custody and control of all executive agencies, set forth government-wide and by agency, and for each at the constructed asset level and at the facility/installation level.

“(iii) (I) The aggregated cost for maintaining all surplus real property under the custody and control of all executive agencies, set forth government-wide and by agency, and for each at the constructed asset level and at the facility/installation level.

“(II) For purposes of subclause (I), costs for real properties owned by the Federal Government shall include recurring maintenance and repair costs, utilities, cleaning and janitorial costs, and roads and grounds expenses.

“(III) For purposes of subclause (I), costs for real properties leased by the Federal Government shall include lease costs, including base and operating rent and any other relevant costs listed in subclause (II) not covered in the lease contract.

“(iv) The aggregated estimated deferred maintenance costs of all real property under the custody and control of all executive agencies, set forth government-wide and by agency, and for each at the constructed asset level and at the facility/installation level.

“(v) For each surplus real property facility/installation disposed of, an indication of—

“(I) its geographic location with address and description;

“(II) its size, including square footage and acreage;

“(III) the date and method of disposal; and

“(IV) its estimated market value.

“(vi) Such other information as the Administrator considers appropriate.

“(C) The congressional committees listed in this subparagraph are as follows:

“(i) The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

“(ii) The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

“(3) ASSISTANCE.—The Administrator shall assist executive agencies in the identification and disposal of excess real property.

“(b) DUTIES OF EXECUTIVE AGENCIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each executive agency shall—

“(A) maintain adequate inventory controls and accountability systems for property under its control;

“(B) continuously survey property under its control to identify excess property;

“(C) promptly report excess property to the Administrator;

“(D) perform the care and handling of excess property; and

“(E) transfer or dispose of excess property as promptly as possible in accordance with authority delegated and regulations prescribed by the Administrator.

“(2) SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO REAL PROPERTY.—With respect to real property, each executive agency shall—

“(A) develop and implement a real property plan in order to identify properties to declare as excess using the guidance issued under subsection (a)(1);

“(B) identify and categorize all real property owned, leased, or otherwise managed by the agency;

“(C) establish adequate goals and incentives that lead the agency to reduce excess real property in its inventory; and

“(D) when appropriate, use the authorities in section 572(a)(2)(B) of this title in order to identify and prepare real property to be reported as excess.

“(3) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—Each executive agency, as far as practicable, shall—

“(A) reassign property to another activity within the agency when the property is no longer required for the purposes of the appropriation used to make the purchase;

“(B) transfer excess property under its control to other Federal agencies and to organizations specified in section 321(c)(2) of this title; and

“(C) obtain excess properties from other Federal agencies to meet mission needs before acquiring non-Federal property.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The item relating to section 524 in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 5 of such title is amended to read as follows:

“524. Duties of the General Services Administration and executive agencies.”.

SEC. 203. ENHANCED AUTHORITIES WITH REGARD TO PREPARING PROPERTIES TO BE REPORTED AS EXCESS.

Section 572(a)(2) of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph:

“(B) ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY.—(i) From the fund described in paragraph (1), subject to clause (iv), the Administrator may obligate an amount to pay the direct and indirect costs related to identifying and preparing properties to be reported excess by another agency.

“(ii) The General Services Administration shall be reimbursed from the proceeds of the sale of such properties for such costs.

“(iii) Net proceeds shall be dispersed pursuant to section 571 of this title.

“(iv) The authority under clause (i) to obligate funds to prepare properties to be reported excess does not include the authority to convey such properties by use, sale, lease, exchange, or otherwise, including through leaseback arrangements or service agreements.

“(v) Nothing in this subparagraph is intended to affect subparagraph (D).”.

SEC. 204. ENHANCED AUTHORITIES WITH REGARD TO REVERTED REAL PROPERTY.

(a) AUTHORITY TO PAY EXPENSES RELATED TO REVERTED REAL PROPERTY.—Section 572(a)(2)(A) of title 40, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) The direct and indirect costs associated with the reversion, custody, and disposal of reverted real property.”.

(b) REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO SALES OF REVERTED PROPERTY UNDER SECTION 550.—Section 550(b)(1) of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting “(A)” after “(1) IN GENERAL.—”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: “If the official, in consultation with the Administrator, recommends reversion of the property, the Administrator shall take control of such property, and, subject to subparagraph (B), sell it at or above appraised fair market value for cash and not by lease, exchange, leaseback arrangements, or service agreements.

“(B) Prior to sale, the Administrator shall make such property available to State and local governments and certain non-profit institutions or organizations pursuant to this section and sections 553 and 554 of this title.”.

(c) REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO SALES OF REVERTED PROPERTY UNDER SECTION 553.—Section 553(e) of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting “(1)” after “THIS SECTION.—”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: “If the Administrator determines that reversion of the property is necessary to enforce compliance with the terms of the conveyance, the Administrator shall take control of such property and, subject to paragraph (2), sell it at or above appraised fair market value for cash and not by lease, exchange, leaseback arrangements, or service agreements.

“(2) Prior to sale, the Administrator shall make such property available to State and local governments and certain non-profit institutions or organizations pursuant to this section and sections 550 and 554 of this title.”.

(d) REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO SALES OF REVERTED PROPERTY UNDER SECTION 554.—Section 554(f) of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting “(1)” after “THIS SECTION.—”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: “If the Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator, recommends reversion of the property, the Administrator shall take control of such property and, subject to paragraph (2), sell it at or above appraised fair market value for cash and not by lease, exchange, leaseback arrangements, or service agreements.

“(2) Prior to sale, the Administrator shall make such property available to State and local governments and certain non-profit institutions or organizations pursuant to this section and sections 550 and 553 of this title.”.

SEC. 205. AGENCY RETENTION OF PROCEEDS.

The text of section 571 of title 40, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(a) PROCEEDS FROM TRANSFER OR SALE OF REAL PROPERTY.—Net proceeds described in subsection (d) shall be deposited into the appropriate real property account of the agency that had custody and accountability for the real property at the time the real property is determined to be excess. Such funds shall be expended only for activities as described in section 524(b) of this title and disposal activities, including paying costs incurred by the General Services Administration for any disposal-related activity authorized by this title. Such funds may also be expended by the agency for maintenance and repairs of the agency’s real property necessary for its disposal or for the repair or alteration of the agency’s other real property. Such funds are available only to the extent and in the amounts provided in annual appropriations Acts, except that such funds shall not be authorized for expenditure in an appropriations Act for any repair or alteration project that is subject to the requirements of section 3307 of this title without a prospectus submitted by the General Services Administration and approved by the Committee on Transportation and Infra-

structure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

“(b) EFFECT ON OTHER SECTIONS.—Nothing in this section is intended to affect section 572(b), 573, or 574 of this title.

“(c) DISPOSAL AGENCY FOR REVERTED PROPERTY.—For the purposes of this section, for any real property that reverts to the United States under sections 550, 553, and 554 of this title, the General Services Administration, as the disposal agency, shall be treated as the agency with custody and accountability for the real property at the time the real property is determined to be excess.

“(d) NET PROCEEDS.—The net proceeds referred to in subsection (a) are proceeds under this chapter, less expenses of the transfer or disposition as provided in section 572(a) of this title, from a—

“(1) transfer of excess real property to a Federal agency for agency use; or

“(2) sale, lease, or other disposition of surplus real property.

“(e) PROCEEDS FROM TRANSFER OR SALE OF PERSONAL PROPERTY.—(1) Except as otherwise provided in this subchapter, proceeds described in paragraph (2) shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

“(2) The proceeds described in this paragraph are proceeds under this chapter from—

“(A) a transfer of excess personal property to a Federal agency for agency use; or

“(B) a sale, lease, or other disposition of surplus personal property.

“(3) Subject to regulations under this subtitle, the expenses of the sale of personal property may be paid from the proceeds of sale so that only the net proceeds are deposited in the Treasury. This paragraph applies whether proceeds are deposited as miscellaneous receipts or to the credit of an appropriation as authorized by law.”.

SEC. 206. DEMONSTRATION AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 530. Demonstration program of inapplicability of certain requirements of law

“(a) AUTHORITY.—Effective for fiscal years 2011 and 2012, the requirements of section 501(a) of the McKinney Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11411(a)) shall not apply to eligible properties.

“(b) ELIGIBLE PROPERTIES.—A property is eligible for purposes of subsection (a) if it meets both of the following requirements:

“(1) The property is selected for demolition by an agency and is a Federal building or other Federal real property located on land not determined to be excess, for which there is an ongoing Federal need, and not to be used in any lease, exchange, leaseback arrangement, or service agreement.

“(2) The property is—

“(A) located in an area to which the general public is denied access in the interest of national security and where alternative access cannot be provided for the public without compromising national security; or

“(B) the property is—

“(i) uninhabitable;

“(ii) not a housing unit; and

“(iii) selected for demolition by an agency because either—

“(I) the demolition is necessary to further an identified Federal need for which funds have been authorized and appropriated; or

“(II) the property poses risk to human health and safety or has become an attractive nuisance.

“(c) LIMITATIONS.—

“(1) No property of the Department of Veterans Affairs may be considered an eligible property for purposes of subsection (a).

“(2) With respect to an eligible property described in subsection (b), the land underlying the property remains subject to all

public benefit requirements and notifications for disposal.

“(d) NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS.—(1) A list of each eligible property described in subsection (b) that is demolished or scheduled for demolition, by date of demolition or projected demolition date, shall be sent to the congressional committees listed in paragraph (2) and published on the Web site of the General Services Administration biannually beginning 6 months after the date of the enactment of this section.

“(2) The congressional committees listed in this paragraph are as follows:

“(A) The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

“(B) The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

“(e) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PROVISIONS OF LAW.—Nothing in this section may be construed as interfering with the requirement for the submission of a prospectus to Congress as established by section 3307 of this title or for all demolitions to be carried out pursuant to section 527 of this title.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 5 of title 40, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 529 the following new item:

“530. Demonstration program of inapplicability of certain requirements of law.”

SEC. 207. PUBLIC BENEFIT CONVEYANCES.

Nothing in this title or the amendments made by this title shall be construed to modify preferences and priorities for public benefit conveyances to State or local governments or other eligible recipients as authorized under section 550 of title 40, United States Code, or other relevant law.

TITLE III—WAIVER OF RECOVERY OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS UNDER DOD CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES VOLUNTARY SEPARATION INCENTIVE PROGRAM

SEC. 301. AUTHORITY FOR WAIVER OF RECOVERY OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS PREVIOUSLY MADE UNDER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES VOLUNTARY SEPARATION INCENTIVE PROGRAM.

(a) AUTHORITY FOR WAIVER.—Subject to subsection (c), the Secretary of Defense may waive the requirement under subsection (f)(6)(B) of section 9902 of title 5, United States Code, for repayment to the Department of Defense of a voluntary separation incentive payment made under subsection (f)(1) of such section 9902 in the case of an employee or former employee of the Department of Defense described in subsection (b).

(b) PERSONS COVERED.—Subsection (a) applies to any employee or former employee of the Department of Defense—

(1) who during the period beginning on April 1, 2004, and ending on March 1, 2008, received a voluntary separation incentive payment under subsection (f)(1) of section 9902 of title 5, United States Code;

(2) who was reappointed to a position in the Department of Defense during the period beginning on June 1, 2004, and ending on May 1, 2008; and

(3) who, as determined by the Secretary of Defense—

(A) before accepting the reappointment referred to in paragraph (2), received a written representation from an officer or employee of the Department of Defense that recovery of the amount of the payment referred to in paragraph (1) would not be required or would be waived, and

(B) reasonably relied on that representation in accepting reappointment.

(c) REQUIRED DETERMINATION.—The Secretary of Defense may grant a waiver under subsection (a) in the case of any individual only if the Secretary determines that recovery of the amount of the payment referred to in that subsection would be against equity and good conscience or would be contrary to the best interests of the United States.

(d) REFUND.—At the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, a person who has repaid to the United States all or part of the voluntary separation incentive payment for which repayment is waived under this section may receive a refund of the amount previously repaid to the United States. The Secretary may use funds authorized to be appropriated for civilian personnel for fiscal year 2011 or any year thereafter.

TITLE IV—PAYGO COMPLIANCE

SEC. 401. PAYGO COMPLIANCE.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go-Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

Amend the title so as to read: “An Act to transfer statutory entitlements to pay and hours of work authorized by laws codified in the District of Columbia Official Code for current members of the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division from such laws to the United States Code, and for other purposes.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia?

There was no objection.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1510, the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division Modernization Act of 2010. The bill was introduced by Senator JOSEPH LIEBERMAN. It passed the Senate by unanimous consent on October 13, 2009. S. 1510 makes a long overdue change by transferring the personnel and pay authorities for the Secret Service's Uniformed Division from the District of Columbia Code to the United States Code. The bill creates a new salary table for the Uniformed Division and also provides the Secret Service with enhanced hiring flexibilities.

S. 1510 deals specifically with the Secret Service's Uniformed Division. There are approximately 1,300 Uniformed Division law enforcement officers who help protect the President, the White House, foreign dignitaries, and mission offices. The Uniformed Division helps provide protective arrangements for the President and other

foreign dignitaries at venues around the world. The measure in S. 1510 was endorsed by the Bush and Obama administrations to respond to ongoing concerns about recruitment and retention within the UD.

According to the Secret Service, the Uniformed Division is currently operating under a salary schedule that is out of parity with other Federal police forces. It performs similar protective tasks as Federal police forces but has the additional duties and responsibility of frequent travel in support of the Service's protective mission. In addition, the Uniformed Division has stricter suitability requirements. Every officer must hold a top secret clearance and undergo a polygraph exam. The Secret Service tells us that staffing shortfalls have continued to increase, despite new recruitment initiatives, and these shortfalls result in the Division incurring overtime costs that would not be required if it were at full staffing.

This is an important bill that ultimately will build a better, more effective Uniformed Division. However, there are costs associated with these improvements. CBO estimates that this legislation would increase direct spending by \$14 million over 10 years. Under House and statutory PAYGO rules, this direct spending must be offset—and this bill is offset. The Oversight Committee has identified an appropriate set of costs associated with the Secret Service bill. The bill we are considering today will actually result in a small amount of net savings for the government. The savings are captured in title II of the suspension amendment, which would add the text of H.R. 2495 to the Secret Service legislation.

H.R. 2495, or the Federal Real Property Disposal Enhancement Act, which is now title II of S. 1510, will make it easier for Federal agencies to sell property that they no longer need. This addresses a longstanding concern of the Government Accountability Office, the Oversight Committee, as well as both the Bush and Obama administrations.

H.R. 2495 was introduced by Representative DENNIS MOORE of Kansas on May 19, 2009. It enjoys bipartisan support, as similar legislation did in the last Congress. The Oversight Committee approved a similar bill in the 110th Congress, and it also passed by voice vote when it reached the House floor.

Lastly, in addition to strengthening the Secret Service and enhancing government efficiency, this legislation would correct an injustice for approximately 40 individuals who returned to government service after September 11. The provisions in title III authorize the Secretary of Defense to retroactively waive repayment of voluntary separation pay for certain individuals who were reemployed in temporary positions by DOD to help respond to terrorist attacks. Before accepting reemployment, these individuals were assured in writing that they would not be

required to repay their separation pay. In making these assurances, the DOD components were apparently following guidance from the Office of Personnel Management on filling emergency positions. Unfortunately, this guidance was not applicable to DOD at that time, and DOD lawyers have determined they do not currently have the authority to retroactively waive the repayment requirement. As a result, even though these individuals received written assurances that they would not be required to repay, the Department has since taken steps to collect the payments for these individuals. This is an injustice created by bureaucratic error and needs to be corrected. This bill provides the Secretary of Defense with the discretionary authority he needs to waive the repayment requirement for these individuals.

I want to thank Representative HANK JOHNSON and the Armed Services Committee for their work and support on title III of this legislation.

I encourage all Members to support the good government efforts in this legislation. These efforts will strengthen the Secret Service, enhance government efficiency, and correct an injustice for civilian DOD employees.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, June 28, 2010.

Hon. EDOLPHUS TOWNS,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government, House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN TOWNS: I am writing to you concerning S. 1510, the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division Modernization Act. There are certain provisions in the legislation which fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services.

In the interest of permitting your committee to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration of this important resolution, I am willing to waive this committee's right to jurisdiction. I do so with the understanding that by waiving consideration of the resolution, the Committee on Armed Services does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill which fall within its Rule X jurisdiction.

Please place this letter into the committee report on S. 1510 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this matter and others between our respective committees.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,

Washington, DC, June 28, 2010.

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding S. 1510, the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division Modernization Act.

I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation and I recognize that the Oversight Committee's floor amendment to this bill contains provisions that

fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services. I agree that your inaction with respect to this bill does not prejudice the House Armed Services Committee's interests and prerogatives regarding this bill or similar legislation.

I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during consideration on the House Floor of S. 1510.

Sincerely,

EDOLPHUS TOWNS,
Chairman.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I compliment the author of this bill. It is one where priorities are being made. It may be small in the bigger picture, but at least the priority is being made. Right now, we're talking about that we have a need in this country to help enhance the compensation for some very critical public servants—not just us personally, but for the country at large.

The fact is, this bill will create a \$15 million savings by looking at surplus property that the taxpayers not only own but have to maintain at this time. Sadly, Mr. Speaker, that \$15 million is a drop in the bucket of what we could be doing. As the Office of Management and Budget estimated, the Federal Government has \$18 billion worth of real property it does not need, and rather than selling this property or marketing it, we usually give it away one way or the other to local governments, States, or nonprofits, rather than getting the fair market value.

I know historically we have always taken this attitude of, if the Federal Government can't use it, let's give it to somebody else. But I think we all agree with the budget crisis the way it is, we need to rethink those priorities and make sure that we recognize that the Federal Government is not in the position of giving their largesse out to other governments or nonprofits.

I have to remind all of us that this bill does make that priority decision. Instead of issuing it to other governments or to nonprofits, it says we need the money within the Federal family, and thus we will liquidate this asset and create the revenue so we can spend it at another location which is a higher priority.

I join in supporting this bill. I think that it sets an example that we should all be looking at, and that is: As we take this step, the question will be, If \$15 million is a good idea, where do we go when we're looking at the \$18 billion that is out there? I think most of us on Government Oversight, especially on the subcommittee that I have the privilege of being the ranking member on, Organization and Procurement, not only have a right, but a responsibility, to take a look at where else do we have resources that are not being tapped for the American people. Where else should we be liquidating our real estate and putting it back into the private market and allowing it to do the magic that the private sector has done for this country for so long? And how

much longer will we horde this real estate when we do not have a foreseen or foreseeable use for it?

Mr. Speaker, I join in not only providing the resources to be able to pay our men and women who protect us every day, but I also join in a policy that says we will now look at the resources of the American people as being that of the American people as a general welfare issue and that we will look at how best to be able to pay our bills with the resources we can generate by liquidating unneeded assets.

Mr. Speaker, I think that Mr. CHAFFETZ of Utah just 2 weeks ago brought up a bill that looked a lot like this. I know this body did not support his bill to go after and try to create that \$18 billion fund for the American people, but I think this bill gives us something we can work with, following the leadership of the gentleman from Utah, and that is, Let's take a look like any family is doing today—what do we own that we do not think we can use, and how do we liquidate that so we can get the resources and the funds that we desperately need to pay our bills?

So at this time I would again encourage my colleagues to join with us in passing this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1500

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I, first of all, want to thank the gentleman from the District of Columbia for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the United States Secret Service Uniform Division Modernization Act, but I also rise today to congratulate the Chicago Blackhawks on their Stanley Cup win over the Philadelphia Flyers. As every sports fan in Chicago knows, the Hawks are proud to share the United Center which is in the heart of my district with that other historic team known as the Bulls. Mr. Speaker, as my daddy used to say: "Life is 95 percent anticipation." Or to use the words of the great American balladeer Bruce Springsteen: "It's been a long time comin', my dear. It's been a long time comin', but now it's here."

Hockey doesn't always get its due share of attention in many parts of America, but some of the most memorable moments in sports are found in hockey. Mr. Speaker, who doesn't know of the "Miracle on Ice" during the 1980 Winter Olympics at Lake Placid, New York, where Team USA defeated the Soviet team which was considered the best in the world. Well, Mr. Speaker, this year's Stanley Cup winner, the Chicago Blackhawks, were like Team USA, the underdogs, the David to the Goliaths of Philadelphia. We weren't the fastest or the highest-scoring team. But what we had was grit, drive, courage, determination, and vision to go with the fired-up fan base.

This is the first Stanley Cup win for the Blackhawks since 1961. The

Blackhawks' recent victory has inspired all of Chicago and aroused fans of the team to a fever pitch. Chicago is red and black all over. The Hawks dominated because of their perseverance, hard work, and dedication to the sport. Johann Gottfried Herder once said, "What destiny sends, bear. Whatever perseveres will be crowned." The Blackhawks have persevered and have been rightly crowned.

I congratulate the Blackhawks' head coach Joel Quenneville for giving his team direction and instilling the determination necessary to achieve this well-deserved victory. And while handing out congratulations, let us not forget the Blackhawks' team captain Jonathan Toews. The youngest Mr. Toews possesses superior leadership skills and ability and was able to guide his team through to victory.

So I thank, again, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia for yielding. I was rushing hard to try to get here before this ended because I am, indeed, proud to represent the world-famous, world-known, world-renowned Chicago Blackhawks who make up a part of the heart and the spirit of the congressional district that I have the good fortune to represent.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to reiterate my strong support for S. 1510, as amended. The bill is PAYGO-neutral. It makes important improvements that will strengthen the Secret Service. It improves government efficiency and helps a handful of DOD civilian employees who have been wronged. I encourage all Members to support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1510, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAULA HAWKINS POST OFFICE BUILDING

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5395) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 151 North Maitland Avenue in Maitland, Florida, as the "Paula Hawkins Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5395

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. PAULA HAWKINS POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 151 North Maitland Avenue in Maitland, Florida, shall be known and designated as the "Paula Hawkins Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the Paula Hawkins Post Office Building.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia?

There was no objection.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

On behalf of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I am pleased to present H.R. 5395 for consideration. This measure designates the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 151 North Maitland Avenue in Maitland, Florida, as the Paula Hawkins Post Office Building. H.R. 5395 was introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Florida, Representative JOHN MICA, on May 25, 2010. It was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform which waived consideration of the measure to expedite its consideration on the floor today. It enjoys the support of the entire Florida delegation.

Paula Hawkins was a Republican Member of Congress who served a single term as a Senator from Florida, fighting to protect children and blazing a trail for women. Paula Hawkins was born on January 24, 1927, in Salt Lake City and passed away on December 3, 2009, at the age of 82. Paula Hawkins was the eldest of three children born to Paul, a naval chief warrant officer, and Leone Fickes. In 1934, the family moved to Atlanta, where her father taught at Georgia Tech. Her parents split when Paula was in high school, and Leone and the children returned to Utah. She finished high school at Richmond, Utah, in 1944, then enrolled at Utah State University. On September 5, 1947, Paula Fickes and Walter Eugene Hawkins were married and moved to Atlanta. The couple had three children before moving to Winter Park, Florida, in 1955, where Paula Hawkins became a community activist and Republican volunteer.

Ms. Hawkins was the first woman elected to a full Senate term without being preceded in politics by a husband or father. She was also the first woman to be a Senator from Florida. While in the Senate, she was the leading sponsor of the Missing Children's Act of 1982, which requires the Federal Bureau of Investigation to enter descriptive information on missing children into a national computer database that can be used by law enforcement agencies across the country.

With incredible courage, she shocked her colleagues by disclosing in a congressional hearing that she had been molested as a child by a neighbor. Besides her daughter Genean and her husband, both of Winter Park, her survivors include another daughter, Kelly McCoy, also of Winter Park; a son, Kevin, of Denver; a sister, Carole Fickes of Sacramento; 11 grandchildren; and 10 great grandchildren. Paula Hawkins was truly an inspiration to Members of Congress and to women everywhere. I therefore urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that Ms. NORTON, the gentlelady from the District of Columbia, is here today. She chairs one of the important subcommittees of Oversight and Government Reform. It's been my honor to serve on that committee for some 18 years. I think most of that time she has been here and has done a great job in representing the citizens of the District of Columbia.

Paula Hawkins would be very proud that Ms. NORTON is here today; and I have served with the two of those individuals, both Paula Hawkins and ELEANOR NORTON. There are many similarities. They are very determined women, very accomplished women, and women who love the people they represent and do a great service for them.

I had the distinction of being the chief of staff for Senator Hawkins from 1980 to 1985. Before that, I knew her in Florida in the community of Maitland. I lived in Maitland Shores. She lived down the street in the city of Maitland. Paula Hawkins was a wonderful lady, a great human being, a patriot, and she really broke a number of the glass ceilings and barriers for women.

I might say, among her accomplishments, she was the first woman elected statewide in the history of the State of Florida, and she did that on her own. She started, actually, in her community, working on some local issues, and she took those local issues to her fellow citizens at city hall. She had their voices heard. And she wasn't elected to any position, just an active community leader. From that, she ran unsuccessfully for the State legislature. But when people saw her talent, they knew that this individual was a fighter for the people.

In fact, she gained the reputation when she got elected statewide to the first office as the "fighting housewife," "the Maitland housewife." She was known affectionately as "the Fighting Maitland housewife" during her entire lifetime, even when she was a Member of the United States Senate because she fought for the people in her community, and she didn't take any hostages. She represented them well. She had her principles, and she had her philosophy. She never wavered. I think her personal morality—she is a member of the Church of Latter-day Saints,

a Mormon, strong in her beliefs, strong in her philosophy, and I think that was also a guiding light for Paula Hawkins.

Along her side during that entire journey was a wonderful individual, Gene Hawkins. Gene survived her. She passed away, as Ms. NORTON said, December 3 of last year, but her memory and her achievements do live on. Not only, as you heard Ms. NORTON describe, was she elected statewide in the State of Florida, but also was the first United States female Senator in her own right—no family member preceded her—and that was quite an accomplishment. We think that now, some 30 years ago; but it was an accomplishment even in 1980 when she achieved it.

When she came to Congress, she set her path, and she had her priorities, and one of those priorities were our children and youth. In fact, they committed to her care a committee that was called, I believe, Family, Youth and Drugs because she was interested in family, she was interested in youth, and she was very dedicated to doing away with the scourge of illegal narcotics.

Now, some people who get involved in committee work make their mark. Paula Hawkins set the mark. She passed, as everyone knows in the country, the national missing children's legislation. She knew that missing and exploited children were a national problem, but not a national priority. I remember when she said, It's amazing that an automobile, a refrigerator can be quickly identified by our law enforcement folks but missing children could not. So she set up the mechanism that long survives her in a national missing children's center that President Reagan opened on June 13, 1984.

□ 1515

There are many accomplishments too, and I'm anxious for this legislation to be heard in the other body. Simple things like there wasn't a Senate daycare center, and that daycare center is still operating today. So not just Members of the Senate—and many of them are far beyond the age of having children eligible for daycare—but there are many hundreds of employees and staff who do have young children, and Paula Hawkins saw that their needs were taken care of. Just a small thing.

There's dramatic legislation. Most people would never know today, almost all of the labor legislation—she was on the Labor Committee in the Senate. But it was interesting to watch her because, being a male and, you know, sometimes men think a little bit differently than women. You don't think of all the problems that women have. And at that point in life, she became their champion.

So the labor laws in this country even today reflect her influence, simple things like trying to make certain that a single woman had some way to get to work, some simple way to care for the child, some consideration for the spe-

cial concerns and needs of women who want to be productive in our society. And even the laws today have the mark of a great United States Senator.

So, today I know many people are focused on the death and loss of Senator BYRD, and many of us who got to know him mourn his loss and his many contributions. Paula Hawkins wasn't here as many terms as Senator BYRD. He was here for nearly half a century. Paula Hawkins was here for only one term, but her deeds and her good works prevail even to this day.

So to her husband, Gene, to her daughters, Genean and to Kelly and to Kevin, her son, we're excited about having in their community, in Paula's community, the Maitland Post Office just down the street from where she lived for many years, a small remembrance. And it is fitting that when we do remember folks like Senator Hawkins, that the public can enjoy their memory. So on the Maitland Post Office will be a plaque dedicating that building and that postal facility to the memory of a great American leader, former United States Senator Paula Hawkins.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentleman from Florida for his kind and generous comparison of my service with that of Paula Hawkins. She was much admired for the breakthroughs that her service represented.

I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MICA. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Again, I am pleased that Ms. NORTON would be here today and honor the memory of my friend. I had the opportunity, as I say, to have worked with Senator Hawkins, both as she built the Florida Republican Party from precinct to the State level, as she built her reputation and service to not only the community of Maitland, of Winter Park, central Florida, Florida, the State, and the Nation, but it is fitting that we do take this step today to name this structure in her honor, a small token of our appreciation for her dedication, her service, her patriotism.

In closing, let me just say that the gentlelady from the District of Columbia probably knows some about my traits. But I have to tell her, in closing, that the one thing I learned from Senator Paula Hawkins is persistence. It beats power. It beats position. It beats wealth. It beats all the cards that may be dealt to you in a positive or negative fashion. But persistence, and I think the gentlelady knows what I mean, that I am a persistent person, and now she knows the rest of the story as to where that persistence came. And it was from the lady we honor here today, Senator Paula Hawkins.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I can only say that the gentleman from Florida learned all too well the lessons of persistence from Senator Paula Haw-

kins. And may I say, as well, whenever the gentleman from Florida is right in his persistence, he will find the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia right there beside him and in his corner.

Mr. Speaker, I again urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5395.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
Washington, DC, June 28, 2010.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 28, 2010 at 9:26 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 3104.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1806

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY of New York) at 6 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9:30 a.m. tomorrow for morning-hour debate and 10:30 a.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 28, 2010.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 28, 2010 at 5:50 p.m.:

That the Senate agreed to S. Res. 568.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MACK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MACK addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF COLONEL ED JACKSON, COM- MANDER OF THE LITTLE ROCK DISTRICT OF THE U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Water Resources, I rise today to thank Colonel Ed Jackson, Commander of the Little Rock District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, for his service, especially his last 3 years in Little Rock.

Colonel Jackson has provided forward-thinking and visionary leadership for an organization with a complex mission. This mission includes the planning and management of civil works projects ranging from navigation, flood control, and hydroelectric power to recreation, water supply, environmental protection, and fish and wildlife mitigation.

Most importantly, during Colonel Jackson's time at Little Rock, his team members have provided vital support to our warfighters deployed on the front lines in Afghanistan and Iraq. Colonel Jackson has firsthand experience with the dangers confronted by our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines, because he commanded the 54th Engineer Battalion during a year-long deployment in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Colonel Jackson's time at Little Rock has included several serious challenges. The district has worked to reduce flood damage and repair public infrastructure affected by serious natural disasters and the effects of age. The district has strengthened its partnership with the Tulsa District in the management and improvement of the Arkansas River Navigation System, a vital transportation corridor of national economic significance.

Finally, the district is carrying out an aggressive plan to ensure that numerous projects to provide jobs and encourage economic development are carried out as quickly as possible in partnership with State and local sponsors. All of this is thanks to the steadfast and reliable leadership of Colonel Jackson.

The colonel has also made improved communication with the public a high priority, reflecting his understanding that we must be helpful and available to citizens as well as elected leaders, including State and local officials. Following floods in early 2008, the colonel recognized that the district needed to improve communication and coordination with local first responders, and the colonel implemented regularly scheduled meetings to ensure disaster preparedness will be a higher priority moving forward.

As Colonel Jackson leaves the Little Rock District, he leaves behind a united civilian leadership team, high morale among the district team leaders, a legacy focusing on and responding to the concerns of citizens and stakeholders alike. For the many successes which his team have accomplished, they can be very, very proud.

As Colonel Jackson moves on to his next assignment, I am confident that

he will continue to render honorable and exemplary service to our country.

RECLAIMING THE MIDDLE GROUND ON GUN OWNERSHIP

(Mr. QUIGLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, today the Supreme Court affirmed sensible restrictions on gun ownership are constitutional. When the Supreme Court struck down Chicago's gun ban earlier today, it reiterated that communities can keep guns away from schools and out of the hands of felons and terrorists. But, today, the gun show loophole makes a mockery of sensible prohibitions like these.

As the recent Pentagon shooting illustrates, terrorists can still easily gain access to firearms. A recent gun show audit conducted revealed that 74 percent of sellers approached by investigators completed sales to people who appeared to be criminals or straw purchasers. This is unacceptable. It is time to close the gun show loophole.

Today's decision puts to rest the tired argument that any sensible gun control restriction is a slippery slope toward the revocation of all gun-owning rights. There has never been a better time for this Congress to reclaim the middle ground and stop giving terrorists unlimited access to unlimited firepower.

□ 1815

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

TRIBUTE TO LANCE CORPORAL GARRETT GAMBLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Marine Lance Corporal Garrett Gamble, who was killed on March 11 while patrolling during combat operations in Helmand Province in Afghanistan. Garrett was a 2008 graduate of Stephen F. Austin High in Sugar Land, Texas. He was assigned to the 2nd Battalion, 2nd Marine Regiment, 2nd Marine Division, II Marine Expeditionary Force, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina.

Garrett was a sportsman and a hockey player—that's right; a hockey player in Sugar Land, Texas—who first considered joining the Marines while a junior in high school. He was known for his big personality, his sense of adventure, and his tender heart. Friends who knew him spoke of his never-ending positive spirit and ability to make

the best of a bad situation. He always put others before himself, and did so with a smile on his face and a kind word for those around him.

Garrett's mother, Michelle, shared with me a powerful story she learned about her son after his death. She was told that when he was a freshman in high school, he took it upon himself to call the mother of a student he knew to tell her that he was worried about her son. He was concerned that her son was headed down a bad path, and he wanted her to know. Garrett never told his mom that he did that, but it made a difference in the life of another young man.

How many times have each of us had an opportunity to make a difference? Do we always seize that opportunity? Garrett Gamble not only acted on those opportunities, but touched the lives of everyone around him.

This is posted on a Facebook page dedicated to Garrett and speaks to his character. "Whether in Sugar Land, Jacksonville, or Helmand, Lance Corporal Garrett W. Gamble approached life with enthusiasm. He was caring, kind, and fun to be around, but he took his job as a U.S. Marine very seriously.

"Garrett spent a lot of time 'outside the wire,' and yesterday, that's where he laid down his life so that we may live in liberty. Thank you, Garrett, for the precious gift of freedom. May you rest in peace with our Lord, and may God's angels surround your family until you are reunited. Sincerely, Pat."

I'd like to close by reading a poem that Garrett's family and friends say epitomizes who he was. It's called "Ode to a Marine, Dedicated to all Marines, Past and Present." It's by Jeannie Salinski.

In a crowd you're bound to spot him,
He's standing so very tall
Not too much impresses him;
He's seen and done it all.
His hair is short, his eyes are sharp,
But his smile's a little blue.
It's the only indication
Of the hell that he's gone through.
He belongs to a sacred brotherhood,
Always faithful 'til the end.
He has walked right into battle
And walked back out again.
Many people think him foolish
For having no regrets
About having lived through many
times

Others would forget.
He's the first to go and last to know,
But never questions why,
On whether it is right or wrong,
But only do or die.
He walks the path most won't take
He's lost much along the way,
But he thinks a lot of freedom,
It's a small price to pay.
Yes, he has chosen to live a life
Off the beaten track,
Knowing well each time he's called,
He might not make it back.
So, next time you see a Devil Dog
Standing proud and true,
Be grateful for all he's given;
He's given it for you.

Don't go and ask him
What's it like to be in a war;
Just thank God that it's your country

He's always fighting for.
And thank him too for all the hell
He's seen in that shade of green,
Thank him for having the guts
To be a United States Marine.

Mr. Speaker, America cannot repay the debt we owe Garrett Gamble. But we can say thank you for his selfless commitment to serve our Nation and thank you to his family for raising such a strong, wonderful Marine. Lance Corporal Garrett Gamble is a true American hero—an ordinary American who did extraordinary things with a short life. A grateful Nation says thank you, Semper Fi, and God bless.

FUTURE OF AMERICAN SPACE EXPLORATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate the opportunity of being here this morning on one of the days when obviously our time management skills are not perhaps the greatest, but it still is nonetheless an opportunity to speak on this floor before you, Mr. Speaker, on a couple of issues that are significant. I appreciate also that I will be joined by my good friend from Texas, who just spoke so eloquently about one of those who has given his all for all of us and how grateful we are for this family and this particular individual.

I think we're going to be hitting several different themes this evening as we talk about the future of this country, especially as it deals with space. And here, once again, I'm grateful the gentleman from Texas is here because Mr. OLSON has indeed been a leader in this particular issue in charting the future of America as far as space policy will be.

It is very easy in this environment to try and focus, first of all, on jobs. I think we will. Because, indeed, as this particular administration is going to begin their summer of recovery tour in which they will be touting the kinds of jobs that will be created to try and change the economic future this country is currently in, it seems almost ironic that administrative policies, especially with NASA, are going to create a vast amount of unemployed individuals—up to 30,000 individuals who will receive their pink slips and be unemployed specifically because of policies initiated by this administration and the current leadership in NASA. It's at least ironic, but we will be talking about that. However, we want to go beyond that because if you're dealing with simply jobs, that can be a very parochial issue. We're also dealing with the future of space and the importance of space. And, clearly, if indeed this ad-

ministration and the leaders of NASA today seem to be de-emphasizing the role of space in our future, other nations are not. The Russians, the Chinese, even the Indian government and the Japanese government have a unique interest in taking our position in the leadership role of space exploration. That's another issue I think we will be talking about.

I also want to make sure that we illustrate how sometimes there are unintended consequences in our actions. This administration and, once again, NASA's leadership did not take into effect the consequences of their program changes and the consequences that would have specifically related to our military preparedness, for indeed one of the things we have to realize is that the component pieces that go into the missiles that shoot somebody to the Moon are the same component pieces that go into missiles that shoot down rockets from our adversaries Iran or North Korea, and that if you harm the industrial base that creates one program, you harm the industrial base that creates the other program, and that gives us some pause to think what we're doing on the defense side of this country, which is clearly one of the few roles specifically given to Congress in the Constitution. Finally, I think I'd like to talk some about a communique that came out from the administration today as to their future in space, and say that some of the platitudes that are very nicely written in this communique are contradictory to the actions that indeed take place.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I think if the gentleman from Texas is prepared to lead off, I would like to turn over as much time to Mr. OLSON from Texas, who, as I said, has for quite a while been the organizer and the leader of this effort to try and explore what this administration is doing, and maybe make some corrections, as is the role and responsibility of Congress dealing with space. Then I will be happy to make some remarks after the gentleman from Texas has completed.

Mr. OLSON. I want to thank my colleague from Utah for allowing me to speak a little bit on an incredibly important issue to our Nation's future. Five months ago, the Obama administration proposed NASA's budget for fiscal year 2011. The proposal included surprisingly drastic decisions just out of the blue to cancel the Constellation program, NASA's follow-on to the space shuttle. Constellation will provide a means and a service to utilize the International Space Station for as long as it needs to—plus, to go beyond low Earth orbit, go to the Moon and beyond. I believed at the time that such a dramatic reversal risks ceding American leadership in human space flight for the future. A lot has transpired since those 5 months, but I still believe canceling the Constellation presents more risks than rewards, creates more challenges than solutions, and raises more questions than it provides answers.

The fact that NASA and the administration cannot or will not provide cogent, comprehensive details related to such a radical policy change should alarm every Member of Congress. My colleagues and I are mainly concerned about our ability to maintain and utilize the international space station; the impact on the aerospace industrial base and our highly skilled workforce, as my colleague from Utah alluded to; and the financial, programmatic, and crew-safety risk of reliance on unidentified commercial crew vehicles. These concerns have not been adequately addressed by the administration. And I've long supported a balanced program that combines Constellation with an increasing role for the commercial sector, beginning with cargo flights to the space station and, over time, evolving to crewed missions. And I will continue to do so.

I'm not alone in advocating this balanced approach. As the heralded Augustine Commission report, when it was released, said that over time, within the aerospace community—even they, even the Augustine report, did not advocate canceling the Constellation. I still believe that this balance exists between government and commercial space. It can exist. And within the budget that's been proposed. Both of these sectors have experienced tremendous successes over the past months—notably the Orion pad abort test in May and the Falcon 9 launch just last month. Yet, rather than focus on the vital elements to maintain American leadership in space, the administration and NASA are distracted with programs that seem to spend money on anything but space.

Many of us are astonished by the misplaced priorities within NASA's budget. Instead of building and testing flight hardware, NASA proposes spending \$1.9 billion to cancel Constellation contracts. Even now, NASA's selective enforcement of a termination liability provision for Constellation contracts is prematurely triggering layoffs across the country. It's been determined that somewhere between 20,000 and 30,000 jobs could be lost nationwide as a result. And we're not just losing jobs. We're losing American know-how. We're losing capabilities and expertise that will be difficult and costly to get back if and when our Nation decides that it wants to explore again. Our space program does not employ people; it invests in them. And, by doing so, we strengthen our Nation's security and our economic well-being.

As if to add insult to injury, last Friday the administration came forward with a request to transfer \$100 million of NASA's already limited resources to the Labor and Commerce Departments to fund an interagency task force to spur "regional economic growth and job creation." Our Nation's best and brightest engineers and technicians don't want or need an interagency task force. They'd much rather be retained and put to use with the critical skills

building and flying American-built spacecraft. The administration claims to have focused on jobs, jobs, jobs. Yet it fails to recognize the destructive impact of canceling Constellation and shifting \$100 million to the Labor and Commerce Departments.

So as we look forward to the next 6 critical months, there are some things we must do. We must get answers from the administration. We in Congress must recognize the impacts on our workforce and our infrastructure. We must pass an authorization bill. And, perhaps most importantly, we must ensure that the final flights of the space shuttle and the continuous operation of the space station are done safely and successfully.

□ 1830

I am both humbled and inspired that while men and women in our human space flight programs watch us debate and question whether jobs will exist, they continue to excel and drive our Nation towards new achievements in space. Their focus, their sacrifice, their dedication and that of the men and women who came before them have enabled the United States to be the global leader in human space flight. Let us work to keep it that way.

If my colleague from Utah would let me, I would like to read this just to show you how important it is to the American people and some of the people that are opposed to the administration's plan. This is the letter that ran in the Orlando Sentinel prior to the President's speech in Florida on April 15. And I think it's worth reading because our Nation's experts and heroes in human space flight, this is how they feel about this administration's budget proposal:

"Dear President Obama, America is faced with the near simultaneous ending of the shuttle program and your recent budget proposal to cancel the Constellation program. This is wrong for our country for many reasons. We are very concerned about America ceding its hard-earned global leadership in space technology to other nations. We are stunned that, in a time of economic crisis, this move will force as many as 30,000 irreplaceable engineers and managers out of the space industry. We see our human exploration program, one of the most inspirational tools to promote science, technology, engineering and math to our young people, being reduced to mediocrity. NASA's human space program has inspired awe and wonder in all ages by pursuing the American tradition of exploring the unknown.

"We strongly urge you to drop this misguided proposal that forces NASA out of human space operations for the foreseeable future. For those of us who have accepted the risk and dedicated a portion of our lives to the exploration of outer space, this is a terrible decision. Our experiences were made possible by the efforts of thousands who were similarly dedicated to the explo-

ration of the last frontier. Success in this great national adventure was predicated on well-defined programs, an unwavering national commitment, and an ambitious challenge. We understand there are risks involved in space flight, but they are calculated risks for worthy goals whose benefits greatly exceed those risks.

"America's greatness lies in her people. She will always have men and women willing to ride rockets into the heavens. America's challenge is to match their bravery and acceptance of risk with specific plans and goals worthy of their commitment. NASA must continue at the frontiers of human space exploration in order to develop the technology and set the standards of excellence that will enable commercial space ventures to eventually succeed. Canceling NASA's human space operations after 50 years of unparalleled achievement makes that objective impossible.

"One of the greatest fears of any generation is not leaving things better for the young people of the next. In the area of human space flight, we are about to realize that fear. Your NASA budget proposal raises more questions about our future in space than it answers. Too many men and women have worked too hard and sacrificed too much to achieve America's preeminence in space, only to see that effort needlessly thrown away. We urge you to demonstrate the vision and determination necessary to keep our Nation at the forefront of human space exploration with ambitious goals and the proper resources to see them through. This is not the time to abandon the promise of the space frontier for a lack of will or an unwillingness to pay the price.

"Sincerely, in the hopes of continued American leadership in human space exploration." The letter was signed by approximately 37 astronauts who span all of our main human space flight programs, from Mercury, Gemini, Apollo, Skylab, Apollo-Soyuz, shuttle station. This is a powerful argument, my friend, as to what we're doing, and what we're doing here is wrong for our country's future. We need to develop the Constellation. We need to get beyond low Earth orbit; and we need to explore, explore like Americans have been doing ever since our forefathers left their homes to come to this country.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate the gentleman from Texas, the points that he made and especially the poignant letter that came out and illustrating how the overwhelming majority—in fact, I would say almost all but one—of our retired astronaut core feels very strongly that Constellation was the right approach for this country to do and that we should continue on with that particular approach.

I would like to go back to a couple of points. I hope I am not redundant, but I think they are significant enough that even if we say them a second time,

it's important. And I would hope the gentleman from Texas would stay here and try to fill in the blanks where I miss those, if we could.

There was quick mention, once again, as I said, on the jobs that we are talking about here. The Vice President recently sent out a press release, announcing that he was going on his summer tour to tout the "Summer of Recovery." Now, amongst the bullet points that they put in that press release was that this administration would be proposing programs to build up to 30,000 miles of new roads, up to 2,000 new water programs, up to 80,000 homes that might be weatherized, 800 jobs here, some there, asking this country to add a nongermane issue to the military supplemental to try to protect government worker jobs.

And I just find that so ironic, as was mentioned, that at the same time we were doing that, the policies of this administration with regard to NASA contract jobs would take between 20,000 and 30,000 people who are part of the private sector, who are doing these jobs well—many of them being scientists and engineers—and they're basically giving them the pink slip at the same time we talk about how we're trying to build jobs in some other way. It simply does not compute that that is the way we're doing it.

I readily admit, some of these jobs that have been threatened and have been lost are personal friends and neighbors of mine. I shared a picture with General Bolden, who is the head of NASA, at one of our committee hearings of a personal friend who has spent 26 years dealing with procurement issues at one of the companies, who is just in his mid-fifties and was just released simply because this is the policy of this particular administration. And I would love to be able to go to him and say, Ray, the reason that your job was terminated was because the government decided to try to save money. The problem is, none of these jobs that are going to be eliminated save the government a dime.

In fact, it is true that this administration is asking for a \$6 billion increase in the NASA budget even though they are going to be stopping the manned space program and throwing up to 30,000 high-paying jobs, employees who have proven their worth for years and years, throwing them out. There are some people who said, Well, the new programs would create new jobs within the NASA-private sector relationship. Yet the most they're talking about there is maybe up to 10,000 jobs to be offset by the 30,000 that we're losing? That's a three-to-one loss in the process that is there.

For a fraction of that \$6 billion of new additional money above and beyond what we're already spending to be focused directly on Constellation, we could continue this program to a successful conclusion. And once again, jobs, I recognize, are parochial. I am part of that situation. But it seems

ironic that in an era in which we're talking about jobs and job creation and more jobs and job creation and realizing that we're never going to get out of these economic doldrums that we're in until we actually do have jobs, we, as a government, are having a policy to try to throw out 30,000 workers who have proven their net, who have proven their worth and are moving this country forward. It just flat out does not make sense.

Mr. OLSON. If my colleague would yield, you're right: it absolutely doesn't make sense. And these just aren't some engineers who have just been doing it for a passing amount of time. These are the best in the world at what they do. These are the rocket scientists of America who led our dominance in human space flight. They have been the best for 50 years. Having been a naval officer, one thing I can tell you, in government agencies like NASA, like the military, you depend on your people to pass down their information to the young people coming up, the new generations who take that information, take that knowledge and exploit it and develop even better vehicles, better space exploration. We're going to lose that. These people are going to walk out the door and take that expertise with them.

If we try to decide as a Nation that we want to rebuild that at some point in the future, we're not going to be able to do it. Those people are going to be gone, and we are going to have to start over from scratch and teach a new generation of young Americans the lessons we learned from going to the Moon and spending 6 months in orbit at the space station. We've learned those things.

And I agree with you on the terms of the priority of the budget. This is the second largest cut in the entire budget, the Constellation program. I mean, that is the largest cut. So you figure, okay, if we're going to cut this money out of the budget, we're cutting the funding to the agency. No, as my colleague alluded to, we're actually giving \$6 billion over a 5-year period to develop global warming research, to transition to these commercial launch vehicles. And I think our priorities are just wrong here. They're wrong for, certainly, our workforce; but they're wrong for America.

One thing I would like to mention too that's hard to put a dollar value on, but the ability of human space flight to inspire youth, to get these jobs, to become astronauts and to pursue the American Dream. I mean, I can tell you as a kid who grew up about a mile and a half from the Johnson Space Center, whose Little League football coach was Joe Engle, the pilot of the second space shuttle, and just growing up in that environment, how much those men and women inspired us, my schoolmates, to want to be astronauts, to want to be part of that. And that still exists today. I see it all around my district.

The administration doesn't seem to realize all the implications of killing this budget. We're killing 30,000 jobs, the best in the world at what they do. We're going to cede U.S. dominance in human space flight, give up some national security possibly, and we are going to lose the ability to inspire our youth. And I also must add, we don't give NASA enough credit for all the things they've developed for us back here on Earth. I mean, everybody here in this gallery has somehow benefited from NASA and their research up there.

If you've got a cell phone, if you've got a satellite GPS, if you've got a pacemaker or some sort of medical device, that's come from NASA. That research has come from NASA, and we're going to throw that away with this budget. That's why we're working very hard to stop it. And I wish the administration would just sit down and talk with us because, Mr. President, you have a voice, but you don't have the final word. The United States Congress, under the United States Constitution, has the final word.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate the gentleman from Texas, if I could reclaim the time briefly. Changing from just the concept of jobs and, indeed, the future of space and especially to put the emphasis on the fact that, what are we going to do to inspire people to go into science and math and become the engineers of the future. Let's face it, if you only build one new plane for our military once every 40 years or if we're only doing one new adventure into space once every 30 years, that doesn't inspire somebody. In fact, supposedly one of NASA's new goals is to try to encourage education into space. And I think, as the gentleman from Texas clearly cited, kids are not dumb; and they're realizing, if you are at a whim firing 30,000 engineers and scientists, that doesn't give you a whole lot of encouragement to try to move into that particular area.

One of the issues especially is because Constellation is the cutting edge of science. It was granted last year by Time magazine as one of the 50 best inventions of the year. In fact, it was number one of the 50 best inventions of last year, and it shows that what we are doing is right. This is the right approach, and this is the approach that is being threatened by the policies of this administration and the current NASA leadership.

The space shuttle had a couple of very sad disasters. In the last one, there was a study made on how to avoid that in the future, and they said, The most important thing we can do—and I think every astronaut understands this, which is maybe why so many of them signed that particular letter from which the gentleman from Texas read—is two goals: NASA will never be effective if, number one, the safety of our astronauts isn't in the most primary and utmost position;

and, number two, you have a clear, understandable and stated goal—what we are going to accomplish.

It is true that during the Bush administration, we decided to halt the space shuttle program. It had run its course. We have been very successful in going to the space station and back, but there were some issues that we needed to go beyond simply space shuttle. So the effort was made to try to put our best minds together and see where we could go into the future that would meet those two goals: a clear statement of purpose and safety. And the reality of that was Constellation. This is the safety concept. This Constellation program is designed to be safer than the space shuttle by a factor of 10.

□ 1845

It was recognized that if you want to try and stop some of the catastrophes we've had today, you separate the cargo from the passengers. That's what Orion does in that process, allows a safety valve for the safety of the passengers, in this case, the astronauts. And in addition, we clearly realized that we needed to go with solid rocket propellants because it is much safer than liquid propellant, perhaps not as powerful, but certainly much more controllable. And, once again, the concept of safety is important. This is the future, if you really care about astronauts.

And the second one was the goal is very clear. The design was for a specific goal. The intent was for a specific goal. And I don't want to be disparaging to this administration, but the apparent goal of this administration with spaceflight is some day, maybe perhaps at some time, we might land on some asteroid somewhere. That's not a specific goal. That's not even a dream. That's not even a reality that we can deal with. That may be almost cartoonish in the approaches to deal with it.

And unfortunately, if we start scaling back, other countries are not. The Russians are still involved. The Chinese are stepping up their involvement in space exploration. As I said earlier, even the Indian Government and the Japanese Government have stated that they have a plan in mind to try and become involved in this concept.

What becomes so bizarre is the United States, that won the space race, is now forfeiting the space future to other countries. We had a plan between the actual startup of Constellation, which is both the Arius rocket and the Orion space capsule, and the end of the space shuttle in which the Russians would have to do some of the taxi service for us. They would charge us somewhere in the neighborhood of \$30 to \$35 million per ride. That's a large amount of money. But, however, our good friends in Russia, after they left communism, have found capitalism to their liking, and they realize what a monopoly gives them the power to do.

In the 2011 budget, NASA wants to budget \$75 million per astronaut ride from Earth up to the space station and back. Now, that's the kind of cost that's coming to the taxpayers of the United States. And I would, once again, maybe be willing to accept it if that was moving America forward. But simply subsidizing the Russian space program instead of building our own program is not what I call smart use of moving us into the future.

In fact, we simply have said that this summer of recovery should be the summer of the Russian and Chinese recovery. We will be subsidizing their missile program, their space exploration program, at the tune of \$75 million every time we send an American astronaut into space on Russian technology to help their program out, to keep their jobs going. And, well, I'm sorry. That just does not make sense as to where our future should be.

Mr. OLSON. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. OLSON. Thank you.

I wanted to get back to your point about needing a goal, having some sort of focus. I'm a Rice University graduate, and we had the honor of President Kennedy coming to our school in the early sixties to make his famous speech where he said, you know, we're going to go to the moon, take a man to the moon and return by the end of this decade. That was a clear goal. Here's our goal. Here's when we're going to do it in. We're going to give you the resources to do it.

When I go home, when I go back to my district, the one thing I hear from both the government employees and the contractors at NASA are, What's our goal? I mean, what are we doing? What's our target? We're going to go to Mars sometime by 2035 or somewhere in that window. We're going to take 5 years to develop a design and make development designs for heavy-lift vehicles, and then we're going to build that 5 years from now.

That's not what makes NASA great. You give these people a goal, give them a time frame and give them the resources they need to do it, they will do it. Every time in our history, they've made some of the greatest technological advancements that mankind will ever know. And again, this administration's budget priorities have nothing to do with that. And again, the ability it has to inspire our kids.

The thing we've gotten into with the Russians now, where we're going to have to depend on them to take our astronauts up to and from the space station—and as my colleague alluded to, you can say what you want about our former communist friends, but they have figured out capitalism in a very short time. And, you know, we were paying about, somewhere over, just over \$20 million per seat last year. That price has gone up now to just a little over 50. We signed a contract, I believe, through 2014, and it's doubtful,

certainly with the administration's budget proposal, that we'll have an American vehicle that can transport us to the space station. We're going to renegotiate that contract. And as my colleague from Utah alluded to, that thing's probably going to double again. This is just a terrible position we've gotten ourselves into.

The Constellation is the program of record, been endorsed by a Republican Congress in 2005, a Democrat Congress in 2008. We need to develop Constellation and stay the course and let our engineers and let our space experts and let our astronauts do what they do to inspire our youth.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. If I could reclaim the time, and I appreciate that comment. And once again, the fact we're throwing out different numbers of what it will cost to send Americans up there is simply because NASA doesn't know what it will cost, and that's why they're budgeting very high. Who knows if that is the actual number. Because once again the Russians realize, when they have a monopoly, they can charge what they want to charge.

Let's deal with another phrase that we often hear from this administration. They are about to commercialize space. I want to try and put that one to rest, if we could. There is no such thing as privatizing or commercializing what we are doing in space.

The Constellation program is being built by private enterprise. There were contracts let by this government that were done on a competitive bid process and won by private sectors, by the private sector, by commercial companies, which means when we cut Constellation, we're not cutting a government program. We're cutting 30,000 jobs in the private sector to build a contract that comes from here.

What the President and the NASA leaders were talking about when they say, well, we're going to commercialize the future of space is not really changing the philosophy of what we're doing. All they're doing is they're going to take the contracts from those who have them now, building Constellation, fire those people, and then we will give some of that extra NASA money that we are going to be appropriating to other companies in the private sector who are going to be winners in the values that this administration places on those particular companies.

In fact, the companies that are talking about the so-called commercialization of space already are under contract with NASA. They are already being subsidized by NASA. They are already behind in their programs with NASA, and they are asking for more Federal dollars for NASA.

So, once again, I oftentimes hear, well, this is an administration that wants to totally change the way we deal with space and they want to try and commercialize everything. That's a cute word, but the reality is you're simply having some people in the private sector who will lose their jobs so

the administration can pick other people in the private sector to have jobs, and not necessarily on a one-to-one ratio.

There is no such thing as commercialization of space or these programs, and we are not trying to come up with a free enterprise approach to the future of space. This is simply the government picking winners and losers among a lot of people who are out there in the private sector. The 30,000 jobs that are going to be lost are not government jobs. Those are private sector jobs.

Mr. OLSON. Yes, sir. My colleague from Utah makes a great point, if he'd yield a little time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield.

Mr. OLSON. Certainly commercial has a place in our future, but they are not anywhere near being ready to do what this administration wants them to do, carry cargo to a space station. They're not there yet. They've had one launch. That's a long, long way to go from being able to carry cargo up to and from the space station.

More important, astronauts, human beings, that is a much, much greater challenge than carrying cargo, and they've got a long way to go. When I talk to experts back home, they say a decade would be a good number for the commercial operators to have manned vehicles. And they've got a long, long way to go.

And one thing I'm concerned about is safety. As my colleague from Utah alluded to earlier tonight, safety is paramount. I mean, we need to do what we've done at NASA. The 50 years they've been in existence, they have put safety of astronauts as the number one concern. And it is a very, very risky endeavor that they do. And we've got to make sure that safety is put first, and that's one of my concerns with these commercial operations.

Again, as my colleague alluded to, economically, it's no different than what we're doing now. But it concerns me that we're going to have people who don't understand NASA's—the safety that's required. And they think that just because they get cargo to the station, they can get crew to the station.

Wrong. You have to do—there's so much more to carry a crew to and from the space station. You've got to insure they're safe. You've got to have the redundancy to the redundancy to the redundancy to the backup to the backup system to ensure that if anything happens to that vehicle from the time it pulls off that pad till the time it gets to the station and comes back down that the crew has the ability to get home safely. And I'm concerned that's one thing that this President's budget proposal doesn't take into account.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate that.

And reclaiming the time once again, I'm glad we're talking about the fact that these are real people in the job market that we're going to be harming. I'm glad we're talking about the overall purpose of our space exploration

program and what it means to them. I'm glad the gentleman ticked off a bunch of areas. I mean, let's face it. When my kids were growing up, the fact that I could put their shoes on with Velcro was a major advantage than trying to tie their shoes. We have those examples in our life.

I'm glad that we're talking about the fact that the Constellation is the future. It is the best science that we have. It is the safest way of going forward. And I'm glad we're talking about the fact that we're not, this entire idea that we're going to privatize our space program which has caught the fancy of some of our colleagues who aren't really perhaps deeply involved in the Science Committee, as the gentleman from Texas is, to realize that's not what we're talking about here. All we're talking about is, once again, government picking winners and losers amongst the private sector to go on with programs that will still be subsidized by the taxpayers. And in some respects, perhaps this is the right approach to do it.

If I could take us into one other direction just for a minute as well, and perhaps this comes back to one of my areas of interest, because I'm on the Armed Services Committee. One of the things that this particular administration failed to do when they announced their new program of canceling Constellation for whatever new goal that they want to have in the future is they failed to communicate with other members of the administration and with other policies and programs within government to see what the impact would have in other government areas. And once again, I'm specifically talking about our military defense system.

As I said in the very beginning, we forget that the people who build rockets and have the component parts to put a man to the moon are the same people who build the component parts and build rockets that shoot down incoming missiles from other countries.

If, indeed, we are going—and once again, as was mentioned earlier, the industrial base that creates these jobs is not something you can turn on and off like a spigot on a water fountain. You can't just decide today we're going to have these scientists; tomorrow we'll fire them and turn it off, and then the next day we'll just open it up and they'll be there again.

What we are doing, if we decimate Constellation, is we're decimating the industrial base that builds our Defense Department missiles at the same time.

The House authorization bill has intent language that tries to quantify what this is because, to be honest, as we started our hearings this year on authorization bills, both for NASA as well as for the Defense Department, we simply asked the question that if, indeed, Constellation is taken out, what impact will it have on the military. And it was clear that the military had never been broached. They had never talked about this. They had not antici-

pated it. However, reports going over a year now, going back to Congress simply said that there would be devastating circumstances and harmful consequences if, indeed, Constellation was stopped for the military side.

Now, in the language that will be presented in the House authorization bill, it simply says that the best estimate we have right now is the cost of military defense on everything that deals with the missile, any kind of propulsion system, is between a 40 to 100 percent increase in the cost to the defense side of our Nation if, indeed, we stop Constellation and you fire those 30,000 workers who are part of that industrial base. That simply means that anything that needs a solid rocket motor, an ICBM, the Navy missile system, double the cost of what it will take just to replace those motors to replace the work and to keep that system functioning. Any kind of strategic missile that has propulsion as part of it, and I hate to say that, but that's every kind of missile that we have, the cost will increase 40 to 100 percent simply because we are losing the expertise and the industrial base. And, indeed, oftentimes those propulsion concepts have a fixed cost to them, so if, indeed, you have to have propulsion in there, there's a fixed cost. If you have less of that, the military will be picking up what is now being shared as far as the cost with NASA at the same time.

Our land-based missile system, our kinetic energy system, even the fact that some of our laser systems in the future will have a negative impact simply because the industrial base that builds those missiles for our military is the same industrial base that builds missiles, the component part, the labor, the propulsion system for NASA for Constellation.

□ 1900

You hurt one, we will hurt the other. And that was a factor that was never considered by the administration or NASA when they came up with their quick decision to try and stop Constellation for something else, some nebulous policy in the future.

Defense of this country is the role of Congress. It's a legitimate question. This administration should have asked those questions ahead of time before they announced the policy. They should have understood what the costs would be and how they planned to handle that cost. As it was, it kind of snuck up on everybody. And now people are trying to play catchup. And the best way of solving that problem is simply go with the winning program, which is Constellation, and continue on with the goal that is safe and has a clear, concise goal message to it. Don't lose the jobs, don't lose the industrial base, don't increase the costs for our military. And let us move forward in an organized, rational approach rather than this helter-skelter idea that takes place at some particular time.

Mr. OLSON. Would my colleague yield?

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Yes, I will be happy to yield.

Mr. OLSON. One thing I am concerned about, as my colleague knows, is the fact that this administration is making NASA a partisan issue in many ways. As you alluded to, I am not sure who proposed this budget or who put it together, but they certainly didn't outreach. It seemed like a very small group of individuals at the White House over at OMB who made these decisions that have dramatic impacts for our Nation.

As you alluded to, I don't think they talked to any of the defense contractors, particularly the ones that developed the missiles for our strategic nuclear deterrence. As I understood it, nothing. They heard nothing. I represent the Johnson Space Center, the home of human space flight. Our center director, when I called him up on February 2 just to sort of get how are people doing, what's the mood there, those type questions, I asked him, when did you find out? He says, I found out about it when you did. I read the paper yesterday.

That's another point. I mean Congress has the oversight. We are the power of the purse. And I am unaware of any outreach from the administration to any Member of Congress prior to this decision being made. I am a freshman here as a Member of Congress, but I have been on the Hill for a number of years, particularly in the military and the Navy. One of the standard things was, if you are going to make a radical change in a program, you went and talked to the committees of jurisdiction, the chairman, the ranking member, and at least sort of gave them the courtesy of what you were planning to do. And I am unaware of anything like that happening.

And again, they are playing politics with this. This thing we are doing with the termination liability, the Anti-Deficiency Act, where they are using—we think it's unprecedented. We are doing some research to find out if it's ever been done in the past. As my colleague knows, what's basically done is, NASA has told the contractors you are going to have to hold some money in reserve for termination liability. You can't spend that on developing rockets and human space flight. You are going to have to hold that in an account in case things get terminated. And what do the companies have to do? The money they were holding for September 30 is now going to be dried up sometime in the middle of August. The only solution they have is to lay off those people.

And again, I don't want to be skeptical, but that gets the administration more of what they want. If those people go, we are going to have a hard time getting them back, and the costs are going to go up. We need to stop this. We can't make NASA a partisan issue. It's been a bipartisan issue. That's its strength. Every American loves human space flight, is proud of America, what we have done in orbit

and what we have done on the Moon. And we've got to go beyond that. And Constellation, as my colleague alluded to, is the best, most tried way so far to do it. There is no reason to get off that path.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. If I could reclaim my time very briefly here again, and once again I appreciate you making those points, because they are spot-on accurate. Congress made its voice very clear last year when we specifically told NASA, Constellation is our program of record, and you will not cut funding to Constellation. It's very clear that Congress has never changed that position. Well, this is speculation, but nor do I think we would, given our own choice of what to do.

But as the gentleman from Texas clearly illustrated, there are some things that NASA is doing right now that appear—I don't want to try and ascribe motives—but they appear clearly to try and force the issue so that by the time Congress goes through its process of coming up with a budget and appropriations process and language directing what the bureaucracies will do, in this case NASA, that this will be a fait accompli.

So the idea of withholding the derivatives was not a reduction of their contracts, but it had the same effect. The idea of taking the Constellation manager and reassigning him had a specific effect. And then, as you alluded to, the idea of telling companies that they are going to have to hold out closing costs, which has never been done in NASA before, in fact there was only one time where Congress did tell them in some way, shape, or form that they needed to close a program, but that's when Congress told them to close a program down, not when they were trying to close it down before Congress has a chance to react to it. But what that would do is simply force them to fire people now so the industrial base is gone before anything takes place.

And that is a strange approach for any kind of executive branch of government to do when the legislative branch has yet to give them any clear direction that's what we want to do, or has spoken. In fact, everything we have said so far is the exact contrary to that. So I appreciate that.

If I could just put one last thing in, and then I will yield to the gentleman from Texas again. The government apparently put out the National Space Policy of the United States today. It's an interesting document. It says that we should have a robust and competitive commercial space sector, which is good. But I promise you, if you take all the jobs away from those who are doing Constellation, there will not be a robust or competitive space program.

They say that we should strengthen U.S. leadership in space-related science. Now, once again we have said over and over again if indeed you stop Constellation, you are ceding leadership in space-related science. We're not

creating leadership. They say we should retain skilled space professionals. Once again, what is happening today is the exact opposite of this effort or this directive.

They say we should reinvigorate U.S. leadership. You don't reinvigorate something if you destroy the program that is our program of record that will move us towards a leadership position. I find this document unusual.

Now, I haven't had a chance to read everything that is in it, but certainly certain things come glaring out in the process of just skimming through it, saying that what we are doing is not necessarily what our words are. If our words here were indeed what our policy is, I would be very happy and content. But what I see happening is not what this policy statement says that we should be doing.

Sometimes I wonder if we really do understand what we are doing in space. And we need to recognize the significance of it, the importance of it, and the importance it has in other aspects of the government, and to our citizens, and to the future to inspiring kids. I yield back.

Mr. OLSON. If my colleague would yield very briefly again, I am just very scared that this administration is turning NASA into a partisan political football, and it's never been that way. Let me read just another quote again from the letter I read earlier that was put together by Walt Cunningham, who was one of our first return-to-flight astronauts after the Apollo 1 disaster. Walt flew in the next Apollo mission. And he has been very adamant and very clear about how he feels this change, this radical budget is going to affect our human space flight future.

Let me just read the three paragraphs that I think are most important. Again, Walt and about 30 other astronauts from every program, every human space flight program we have, signed this letter: "Too many men and women have worked too hard and sacrificed too much to achieve America's preeminence in space, only to see that effort needlessly thrown away. We urge you to demonstrate the vision and the determination necessary to keep our Nation at the forefront of human space exploration with ambitious goals and the proper resources to see them through. This is not the time to abandon the promise of space frontier for a lack of will or an unwillingness to pay the price." Yet that's exactly what this budget proposal does.

And I am very scared that this has become a partisan issue that doesn't serve America well, that doesn't serve our future well. As my colleague alluded, Republican Congress endorsed the Constellation, Democrat Congress endorsed the Constellation. You hear people out there say this is George Bush's plan. Yes, it was his plan, but it's been endorsed by, again, a Republican Congress and a Democrat Congress. It's not Bush's plan. It's America's plan. And we need to see it through.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. If I could just reclaim for just one particular second right here. Once again, and I appreciate you bringing that point out, I think the pushback or the outrage in Congress has been a bipartisan pushback and outrage. Republicans and Democrats alike have said the approach this administration is taking is not necessarily the right approach. Because indeed, Constellation is a safer, better system than the space shuttle. It is the new way forward. It shows what is the best and the brightest that this country has to offer. It is something that makes us good and makes us noble. It is the direction we should go into the future.

And for us to back off now for some program that is not clear, is not understandable, has no discernible goals, that's just not the way a country moves forward. It is indeed the way a country moves backwards, and this country should not be moving backwards.

I appreciate the gentleman from Texas's leadership on this particular issue, everything that he has been doing in organizing our review, our reports, some of our complaints, too, as we try and say what we need to do is do that which moves the country forward and ennobles us as a people. Constellation does that. A clear space mission does that. A mission emphasizing safety for astronauts does that. That's what we need to continue on. And I'm sorry, but what NASA is asking us to do right now does not meet those goals.

I yield back for any concluding statements the gentleman has.

Mr. OLSON. Yes, I will be very brief here. You are very aware of the Orion Pad Abort, the very successful launch test we had I believe it was in late April or early May. Good chance you could get a Time magazine from this upcoming year, and that's going to be on the cover of that magazine. That was a flawless, flawless test.

In fact, if you remember, the rocket got off the pad so quickly at White Sands that the cameras that are there to track rockets—I mean they are there to track all rockets—couldn't keep up with it because it was moving so darn fast. And that's the program of record.

And I will just conclude by saying what I tell people all across this country. The President and the administration have a voice in this process, but they don't have the final word. The United States Congress has the final word. And I am confident that at the end of the day, Constellation is still going to be the program of record. I thank my colleague, and yield back my time to him.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your time and efforts. We yield back.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS HOUR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 6, 2009, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

(Ms. FUDGE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FUDGE. I appreciate the opportunity to anchor this Special Order hour on Wall Street reform for the Congressional Black Caucus. Currently, the Congressional Black Caucus, the CBC, is chaired by the Honorable BARBARA LEE from the Ninth Congressional District of California.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to our chair, the Honorable BARBARA LEE.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me thank Congresswoman FUDGE for once again being on the mark in terms of the Special Order tonight. She has taken the leadership on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus to really bring the message of the Congressional Black Caucus to the country. Tonight, Congresswoman FUDGE will be talking about the urgent need to enact regulatory reform of America's financial markets.

So thank you for your leadership. I know your district is going to benefit tremendously from this. Oftentimes we forget that regulatory reform also has a direct impact on the huge foreclosure crisis that I know your district is facing. So thank you again for your leadership.

Let me just thank, first of all, all Members who were on that Financial Services Committee for such a major effort to take this important step in protecting Americans from another financial crisis. While many provisions in the bill could be much stronger, I believe that H.R. 4713 is a critical step forward in bringing some reasonable regulations and oversight back to an out of control financial services sector.

I actually was on the Banking Committee during much of the deregulation process and could not support it then. And unfortunately, what those of us on the committee saw happening and said would happen has happened. But now this important legislation will finally make our banks and financial services institutions much more transparent, put consumer rights before corporate profits, and allow shareholders more of a say on skyrocketing CEO pay packages.

While I would have preferred a standalone Consumer Financial Protection Agency, this bill will create an independent agency that remains independent and puts consumers first. I am pleased that more transparency on CEO pay is included in these reforms. While I might have preferred some reasonable constraints, like my bill that would limit tax deductibility of executive pay, allowing shareholders to have a say on pay is a good step forward.

I remain concerned that rules on risky derivatives trading, limits on proprietary trading by our biggest banks, and controls over the operations

of ratings agencies may not be strong enough to prevent continued risk to our markets and taxpayers. I had hoped that more could be done to ensure that banks pay for their failures. But I know that we must pass these reforms and we must pass them now.

So I hope that my colleagues across the aisle will join us in the effort to protect consumers, shareholders, and the open and honest functioning of the financial markets that are so critical to our continued prosperity. I hope that we have all come to understand how ridiculous it is to claim that the markets can regulate themselves, and that we can agree that the government has a critical role in ensuring that our financial services sector functions fairly, with transparency, and allows equal opportunity for all Americans.

I look forward to working with the regulators as they begin to implement these new protections for investors and consumers. I hope that we can work together to make sure that we are never again, never again held hostage to out of control greed on Wall Street and regulators who really were asleep at the switch.

Thank you again. Thank you, Congresswoman FUDGE, for your leadership.

□ 1915

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to continue to express my support for our Chair. She is very strong and courageous and keeps us on task. I just appreciate her hard work and her leadership, not only for the Congressional Black Caucus but for our caucus in general. Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

Mr. Speaker, tonight we will focus on the need for this Wall Street reform that Americans have been waiting for. Americans have faced the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression. Millions have lost their jobs, businesses have failed, housing prices have dropped, and savings have been wiped out. A year and a half after the country's banking system nearly imploded, it is still operating under the same inadequate rules and regulations. The failures that led to this crisis require bold action. We must restore responsibility and accountability in our financial system to give Americans confidence and the protections they need. We must create a sound foundation to grow the economy and to create jobs. This is in fact why Congress is set to vote this week on the Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act. Despite vigorous lobbying from the banks, this bill protects the American people and the financial system from abuses that nearly caused the entire system to collapse. This bill contains commonsense reforms that hold Wall Street and the big banks accountable.

It will end bailouts by ensuring that taxpayers are never again on the hook for Wall Street's risky decisions. It will protect families' retirement funds, college savings, homes and businesses' financial futures from unnecessary risk

by CEOs, lenders and speculators. It will protect consumers from predatory lending abuses, from the fine print and industry gimmicks. And it will inject transparency and accountability into a financial system that has run amok.

Wall Street reform is good for our country because it is a critical step to create jobs and grow the economy. Years without accountability from Wall Street and the big banks have cost us 8 million jobs. Having a healthy financial system will help spur lending to businesses, of course, which will grow our economy. As we rebuild our economy, the new commonsense rules from this bill will ensure that big banks and Wall Street can't play games again with our futures.

Americans want fairness, Mr. Speaker. They deal openly and honestly with their banks, and they want their banks to treat them like the good customers that they are.

There was a meltdown. For 8 years, Mr. Speaker, under the previous administration, our allies on the other side of the aisle looked the other way as Wall Street and the big banks exploited loopholes. Americans had no clue that Wall Street barons were gambling away their money on complex schemes and being handsomely rewarded for failure and for recklessness. America's families and small businesses paid the price. We lost 8 million jobs and \$17 trillion in retirement savings and Americans' net worth in this meltdown. It was the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression.

There are tough choices. This Congress and our President, President Obama, have made tough choices and taken effective steps to bring our economy back from the brink of disaster. The Recovery Act has already saved or created up to 2.8 million jobs and much of the TARP has already been repaid. But more must be done.

The next step is the Wall Street reform. It is a critical step to create jobs and grow the economy. As we rebuild our economy, we must establish commonsense rules to ensure big banks and Wall Street can't play Russian roulette again with our futures. Wall Street may be bouncing back, but we know from experience they are not going to police themselves.

Let me just talk a bit about what is in this legislation. This bill protects hardworking Americans from the worst abuses in the financial industry. I'd like to share with you just some of the consumer protections that are included in this bill: There is protection for families and small businesses by ensuring that bank loans, mortgages, and credit card terms and disclosures are fair and understandable. Transparency in the industry will be overseen by the new Consumer Financial Protection Agency. Credit card companies will no longer be able to mislead you with pages and pages of fine print. You will no longer be subject to hidden fees and penalties, or the predatory practices of unscrupulous lenders. This bill will

make lending agreements easier to understand and protect small borrowers.

It ends predatory lending practices that occurred during the subprime lending frenzy that this country experienced. The legislation outlaws many of the egregious industry practices that led to the subprime lending boom. It ensures that mortgage lenders make loans that benefit the consumer. It would establish a simple standard for all home loans: institutions must review proof of income to ensure that borrowers can repay the loans they are sold. This legislation will force mortgage companies to play by the rules. You'll be empowered with easy-to-understand forms. And you'll have clear and concise information to make financial decisions that are best for you and your family.

Financial firms will no longer be able to engage in behavior that is so risky and irresponsible that it threatens to bring down the entire economy. This bill replaces taxpayer bailouts with new procedures to unwind failing companies that pose the greatest risk. This wind-down process will be paid for by the financial industry and not by taxpayers.

It produces tough new rules on the riskiest financial practices that gambled with your money and caused the financial crash, like the credit default swaps that devastated AIG, and commonsense regulation of derivatives and other complex financial products offered to consumers.

It provides tough enforcement and oversight with more enforcement power and funding for the Securities and Exchange Commission, including the registration of hedge funds and private equity funds. It provides enhanced oversight and transparency for credit rating agencies whose seal of approval gave way to excessively risky practices that led to a financial collapse.

It protects investors. It strengthens the SEC's power so it can better protect investors and regulate the Nation's securities markets. Reining in egregious executive compensation, allowing a "say on pay" for shareholders, requiring independent directors on compensation committees, and limiting bank executive risky pay practices that jeopardize the safety and soundness of banks.

As a member of the CBC, one important part of the bill I would like to highlight is the new Offices of Minority and Women Inclusion. At Federal banking and securities regulatory agencies, the bill establishes an Office of Minority and Women Inclusion that will, among other things, address employment and diversity contracting opportunities with the Federal Government. The offices will coordinate technical assistance to minority-owned and women-owned businesses and seek diversity in the regulatory workforce. By actively engaging minorities and women, the Nation's financial system will become stronger.

Mr. Speaker, nearly 2 years after our Nation's financial system stood on the

verge of collapse, Congress is working hard to protect American consumers and to grow our economy. The Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act will accomplish both goals. This sweeping new legislation will modernize America's financial rules in response to the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression. Once signed into law, these tough new regulations will hold Wall Street accountable, it will end taxpayer-funded bailouts, and protect Americans from unscrupulous big banks and credit card companies. Wall Street reform is a win for the American people. This is about making the system fair and accountable. The financial crisis that unfolded in 2008 should never have happened. But since it did, this Congress has been working hard to develop legislation that will prevent a future crisis.

I support the Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act because it includes commonsense reforms that hold Wall Street and the big banks accountable. But most of all, Mr. Speaker, this bill supports the American people. Let's give Americans what they deserve—fairness in the financial system.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BOOZMAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, July 2.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, July 2.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, July 2.

Mr. MACK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BOOZMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, today and June 30.

Mr. OLSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FORBES, for 5 minutes, June 29.

Mr. MCHENRY, for 5 minutes, June 29, 30, July 1, and 2.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on June 24, 2010 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 3962. To provide affordable, quality health care for all Americans and reduce the growth in health care spending, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 29, 2010, at 9:30 a.m., for morning-hour debate.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to Public Law 111-139, Mr. SPRATT hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of the bill S.1510, the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division Modernization Act of 2010, as amended by the House, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CBO ESIMATE OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR S. 1510, AN ACT TO TRANSFER STATUTORY ENTITLEMENTS TO PAY AND HOURS OF WORK AUTHORIZED BY LAWS CODIFIED IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA OFFICIAL CODE FOR CURRENT MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE UNIFORMED DIVISION FROM SUCH LAWS TO THE UNITED STATES CODE, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES, AS PROVIDED BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET ON JUNE 25, 2010

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—											
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2010–2015
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Impact ^a	0	0	0	–1	–1	–1	–1	–1	–1	–1	–1	0

^a S. 1510 consists of three titles, concerning the United States Secret Service, the General Services Administration (GSA), and the Department of Defense (DOD).

Title I would increase the annuity paid to retired members of the Secret Service Uniformed Division who participate in the District of Columbia Police and Firefighters Retirement and Disability System by 2.5 percent. CBO estimates that this change would increase payments (direct spending) to retired Secret Service employees by about \$13 million over the 2010–2020 period.

Title II would amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act to change the disposal process for surplus federal property by allowing GSA to retain and spend, without further appropriation, a larger share of the proceeds from property sales. CBO estimates that the title would increase direct spending by more than \$15 million over the 2010–2020 period, but also would lead to the receipt of more than \$30 million from additional property sales over the same period. Thus, title II would reduce net direct spending by about \$15 million.

Title III would allow DOD to waive recovery of certain voluntary separation incentive payments. Without that waiver authority, those recovered payments would be deposited in the Treasury. Waiving those repayments would result in foregone receipts, and thus, increase direct spending by about \$1 million over the 2010–2020 period.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8122. A letter from the Principal Deputy, Department of Defense, transmitting letter providing notice that a commercial helicopter under contract with the Department was destroyed by hostile fire; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8123. A letter from the Acting Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

8124. A letter from the Director, office of Policy, Reports and Disclosures, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Notification of Employee Rights Under Federal Labor Laws (RIN: 1215-AB70; 1245-AA00) received June 8, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8125. A letter from the Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Atlanta, transmitting the 2009 management report and statements on system of internal controls of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Atlanta, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8126. A letter from the First Vice President, Controller and Chief Accounting Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Boston, transmitting the 2009 management report and statements of internal controls of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Boston, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8127. A letter from the President, Federal Home Loan Bank of Cincinnati, transmitting the 2009 management report and statements on system of internal controls of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Cincinnati, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8128. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — 2010 Annual Determination for Sea Turtle Observer Requirements [Docket No.: 0906181067-0167-02] (RIN: 0648-XP96) received June 4, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

8129. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Deep-Sea Red Crab Fisheries; 2010 Atlantic Deep-Sea Red Crab Specifications [Docket No.: 100105009-0167-02] (RIN: 0648-AY51) received June 4, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

8130. A letter from the Staff Director, Commission Civil Rights, transmitting notification that the Commission recently appointed members to the Colorado Advisory Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8131. A letter from the Staff Director, Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting notification that the Commission recently appointed members to the Louisiana Advisory Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8132. A letter from the Staff Director, Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting notification that the Commission recently appointed members to the Oregon Advisory Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8133. A letter from the Deputy Chief Financial Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting notification that a transfer of \$100 million from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to the Emergency Fund has occurred; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8134. A letter from the Deputy Associate Commissioner, Office of Regulations, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Consultative Examination — Annual Onsite Review of Medical Providers [Docket No.: SSA-2006-0109] (RIN: 0960-AH17) received June 4, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8135. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's report to Congress concerning the Mixed Oxide (MOX) Fuel Fabrication Facility being constructed at the Department's Savannah River Site near Aiken, South Carolina, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 4306(a)(3); jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Energy and Commerce.

8136. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a joint report that describes activities related to the Proliferation Security Initiative, including associated funding, that are planned to be carried out by the United States over the next three fiscal years; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1554. A bill to take certain property in McIntosh County, Oklahoma, into trust for the benefit of the Muscogee (Creek) National, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-513). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2340. A bill to resolve the claims of the Bering Straits Native Corporation and the State of Alaska to land adjacent to Salmon Lake in the State of Alaska and to provide for the conveyance to the Bering Straits Native Corporation of certain other public land in partial satisfaction of the land entitlement of the Corporation under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act; with an amendment (Rept. 111-514). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAHALL: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4445. A bill to amend Public Law 95-232 to repeal a restriction on treating as Indian country certain lands held in trust for Indian pueblos in New Mexico; with an amendment (Rept. 111-515). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. HALL of New York (for himself and Mr. MCMAHON):

H.R. 5609. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit any registered lobbyist whose clients include foreign governments which are found to be sponsors of international terrorism or include other foreign nationals from making contributions and other campaign-related disbursements in elections for public office; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FILLNER, and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 5610. A bill to provide a technical adjustment with respect to funding for independent living centers under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 in order to ensure stability for such centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MICA, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. PETRI, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H.R. 5611. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 5612. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to temporarily increase the investment tax credit for geothermal energy property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TONKO, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 5613. A bill to require that vessels used to engage in drilling for oil or gas in ocean waters that are subject to the jurisdiction of the United States must be documented under chapter 121 of title 46, United States Code; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ADERHOLT (for himself, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BONNER, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. OLSON, Mr. POSEY, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. BRIGHT):

H.R. 5614. A bill to impose certain requirements on the expenditure of funds by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the Constellation program; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. BILBRAY:

H.R. 5615. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the medical device tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CLAY (for himself and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 5616. A bill to authorize appropriations for the National Historical Publications and Records Commission through fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 5617. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for home energy conservation bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT (for himself and Mr. LEVIN):

H.R. 5618. A bill to continue Federal unemployment programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Com-

mittee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 5619. A bill to amend the SAFE Port Act to provide for the eligibility of certain third party logistics providers for participation in the Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism program; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida):

H.R. 5620. A bill to amend the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996 to exclude from the United States aliens who contribute to the ability of Cuba to develop petroleum resources located off Cuba's coast and to provide for the imposition of sanctions and prohibition on facilitation of development of Cuba's petroleum resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Financial Services, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California (for herself, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. PAUL):

H.R. 5621. A bill to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 to authorize funds in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund to be used to pay up to 100 percent of the eligible costs of preparing Federal environmental impact statements for certain navigation projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WATSON:

H. Res. 1480. A resolution commending the University of Southern California Trojan men's tennis team for its victory in the 2010 National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Men's Tennis Championship; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ (for herself and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas):

H. Res. 1481. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "National Save for Retirement Week", including raising public awareness of the various tax-preferred retirement vehicles and increasing personal financial literacy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BILBRAY (for himself and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H. Res. 1482. A resolution commemorating the 40th annual meeting of the Society for Neuroscience; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GINGREY of Georgia (for himself and Mr. SKELTON):

H. Res. 1483. A resolution recognizing the exemplary service and sacrifice of the soldiers of the 14th Armored Division of the United States Army, known as the Liberators, during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

327. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 282 urging the Congress to propose a constitutional amendment to clarify the distinction between the rights of natural persons and the rights of corporations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

328. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 30 urging the President and the Congress to pass S. 1337, The Filipino Veterans Family Reunification Act of 2009; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

329. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, relative to House Resolution No. 1081 urging the Congress to pass H.R. 3410, the Taking Responsible Action for Community Safety Act; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

330. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 82 urging the President and the Congress to expedite the processing of all claims for payment, and the distribution of checks to Filipino veterans under ARRA; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

331. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 65 supporting congressional and state funding for broadband infrastructure in rural areas; jointly to the Committees on Agriculture and Energy and Commerce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 442: Ms. JENKINS and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

H.R. 484: Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 571: Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 697: Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts and Ms. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 745: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1034: Mr. MAFFEI.

H.R. 1036: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1203: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 1230: Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 1240: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 2083: Mr. HOEKSTRA.

H.R. 2378: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2866: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. PAULEN.

H.R. 2870: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 3025: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 3286: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 3408: Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. OWENS, Mr. CHILDERS, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. HILL.

H.R. 3487: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 3508: Mr. DJOU.

H.R. 3729: Ms. GIFFORDS and Mr. WU.

H.R. 3790: Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 4051: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 4128: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 4296: Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 4308: Mr. FLAKE.

H.R. 4505: Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 4557: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 4597: Ms. HIRONO and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 4693: Mr. HALL of New York.

H.R. 4883: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 4894: Mr. DJOU.
H.R. 4943: Mr. SCALISE.
H.R. 5081: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 5211: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 5234: Mr. BARROW and Mr. KINGSTON.
H.R. 5244: Mr. BOOZMAN.
H.R. 5258: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California and Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 5268: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey and Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 5358: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 5359: Mr. BACA.
H.R. 5374: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. BILBRAY.
H.R. 5426: Mrs. EMERSON and Mr. HILL.
H.R. 5434: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 5457: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 5478: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 5501: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
H.R. 5503: Mr. BACA and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 5523: Mr. MCCLINTOCK and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 5525: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 5572: Mr. ORTIZ.
H.R. 5577: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 5578: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 5579: Ms. LEE of California.
H. Con. Res. 207: Mr. TIAHRT.
H. Con. Res. 284: Mr. SABLAN and Mr. CASTLE.
H. Con. Res. 287: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H. Res. 202: Mr. GORDON of Tennessee.
H. Res. 308: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H. Res. 510: Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. BURGESS.
H. Res. 937: Mr. PIERLUISI.
H. Res. 1207: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H. Res. 1244: Mr. POLIS of Colorado.
H. Res. 1279: Mr. CALVERT.
H. Res. 1365: Mr. EDWARDS of Texas.
H. Res. 1401: Mr. STARK, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. CRITZ, and Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H. Res. 1437: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H. Res. 1450: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H. Res. 1454: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H. Res. 1460: Mrs. LUMMIS.